DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 328 CG 005 663

AUTHOR	Owen, Isaiah
TITLE	The Effect of the Group Leader(s) Race on Group Counseling Undertaken to Improve Intergroup Attitude Among Racially Mixed Fifth and Sixth Grade Children.
INSTITUTION	West Virginia Univ., Morgantown.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	110p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.60
DESCRIPTORS	Attitudes, Counseling, *Elementary School Students, *Group Counseling, Group Membership, *Leadership, Race Influences, *Racial Attitudes, *Racial Integration, Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was: (1) to determine the effect, if any, that the race of the group leader has on the improvement in intergroup attitude of racially mixed elementary school students who participate in group counseling; and (2) to determine whether racially mixed groups of elementary students who participate in group counseling make more favorable improvement than those who engage in contact activities only. A total of 10 students were taken from the total fifth and sixth grade population who had been tested. These 10 were assigned to each of six groups: (1) one led by a white counselor; (2) one by a black counselor; (3) one by a black and a white counselor; (4) three control groups of the same composition. At the end of eight weeks, these subjects were post-tested on the same instruments as before. Findings include: (1) no differences in the mean gains in intergroup attitudes among the six groups; (2) no differences in gains in attitude between the counseled groups and control groups; (3) no differences in the mean gains in attitudes between any of the three experimental groups. The study produced no significant findings that would show group counseling to be an effective means of alleviating racial attitudes. (Author/KJ)

ED041328

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE EFFECT OF THE GROUP LEADER(S) RACE ON GROUP COUNSELING UNDERTAKEN TO IMPROVE INTERGROUP ATTITUDE AMONG RACIALLY MIXED FIFTH AND SIXTH GRADE CHILDREN

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School
of
West Virginia University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Education

by
Isaiah Owen

Morgantown
West Virginia
1969

CG 005 663

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This author wishes to acknowledge gratitude to members of his doctoral committee: Dr. G. E. Stormer, chairman, whose guidance and encouragement were instrumental in carrying out this study; Dr. Duane Brown whose counsel and encouragement were invaluable; Dr. Lynn Ourth, Dr. Rogers McAvoy and Dr. Meng-shu Tseng whose many suggestions helped to make this study possible.

A very special thanks is given to Mr. Finis E. Dew who gave generously of his time to assist the author in carrying out the group counseling sessions for the study.

Gratitude is expressed to Dr. Edward T. Shuma, Mr. Charles W. Nallen, Mr. Charles R. Moore, and their staff members in the Marion County Schools whose cooperation was most helpful in making this investigation possible.

The author wishes to extend appreciation to his children, Jacqueline and James, for their patience while their father was engaged in the writing phase of this study.

The author wishes to dedicate this endeavor to his wife, Joanne Owen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES v

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 5

Hypotheses 6

Justification of the Problem 7

DEFINITION OF TERMS 8

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 11

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 13

The Racial Problem 13

The Development of Racial Awareness 16

Source of Intergroup Attitude 20

Interethnic Contact 22

Group Counseling Rationale and the Teleoanalytic Approach 25

The Semantic Differential 31

The Ohio Social Acceptance Scale 33

Self-Concept and the Self-esteem Inventory 35

Racial Factors in Counseling 37

Generalizations from Research 38

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES 41

POPULATION AND SAMPLE 41

Chapter Page

DESIGN 41

DESCRIPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF INSTRUMENTS 43

The Semantic Differential 43

The Ohio Social Acceptance Scale 45

Self-esteem Inventory 47

Statistical Treatment 48

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND FINDINGS 51

TABULATION OF SCORES 51

Analysis of Data 52

Post Hoc Analysis 60

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 74

Statement of the Problem 74

Summary 74

Conclusions 76

Recommendations 78

BIBLIOGRAPHY 80

APPENDIX A 88

APPENDIX B 91

APPENDIX C 94

APPENDIX D 98

ABSTRACT 101

VITA 105

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

I. Group Means for Gains on the Semantic Differential 57

II. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table I 57

III. Group Means for Gains on the Social Acceptance Scale ... 58

IV. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table III 58

V. Group Means for Gains on the Self-esteem Inventory 59

VI. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table V 59

VII. Group Means for Gains on the Semantic Differential for Boys 62

VIII. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table VII 62

IX. Group Means for Gains on the Social Acceptance Scale for Boys 63

X. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table IX 63

XI. Group Means for Gains on the Self-esteem Inventory for Boys 64

XII. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table XI 64

XIII. Group Means for Gains on the Semantic Differential for Girls 65

XIV. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table XIII 65

XV. Group Means for Gains on the Social Acceptance Scale for Girls 66

XVI. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table XV 66

XVII. Group Means for Gains on the Self-esteem Inventory for Girls 67

XVIII. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table XVII 67

IXX. Group Means for Gains on the Semantic Differential for Negroes 68

Table Page

XX. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table IXX 68

XXI. Group Means for Gains on the Social Acceptance Scale for Negroes 69

XXII. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table XXI 69

XXIII. Group Means for Gains on the Self-esteem Inventory for Negroes 70

XXIV. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table XXIII 70

XXV Group Means for Gains on the Semantic Differential for Whites 71

XXVI. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table XXV 71

XXVII. Group Means for Gains on the Social Acceptance Scale for Whites 72

XXVIII. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table XXVII 72

XXIX. Group Means for Gains on the Self-esteem Inventory for Whites 73

XXX. Analysis of Variance for Data in Table XXIX 73

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

If misunderstandings that exist among ethnic groups in today's society are the end products of perceptions that have been distorted to the extent that they have become self-fulfilling, then these misunderstandings are analogous to self-fulfilling prophecies in which events follow a course which has been predetermined. In the case of younger children, we may surmise that those who learn derogatory information concerning ethnic groups would through misperception confirm this information in later years. These misperceptions are deep-seated in our culture and as Trager and Radke-Yarrow[1] point out are frequently the result of adults having denied children personal experiences from which they might have formed their own opinions concerning others who differ from themselves in some respect.

An example of these dysfunctioning perceptions is the intergroup attitude held by many members of both the black and white races. These attitudes not only place a stigma on our national image but contribute to what Dr. James B. Conant[2] refers to as the "social dynamite of our time". Levine attests to the gravity of the situation by refering to the racial disorders of past summers as the consequences of racial isolation at all levels, and of attitudes produced by three centuries of myth, ignorance, and bias. LeVine concludes that it is essential to the future of American society that integration be supported as the priority of education strategy.[3]

---

[1] Helen G. Trager and Marian Radke-Yarrow, They Learn What They Live (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), p. 347.

[2] James B. Conant, Slums and Suburbs (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961), pp. 2, 146.

The racial issue presents a complex pattern of interwoven problems, the solutions for which are equally perplexing. One would be naive to assume that a dilemma which has reached the tragic proportions of racism could find its solution in any single panacea, nonetheless in a nation permeated with separation the necessity for providing situations which will facilitate a reduction in the growing polarity between blacks and whites is quite apparent. Assuming the racial issue is in every sense intrinsic to public education, the situation demands that educators investigate the techniques at their disposal which may (1) create situations in which both black and white children may develop more positive attitudes toward one another and (2) effect positive changes in attitudes that have already been established. That racial attitudes are generally well established by the time children are in the upper elementary grades is supported by the literature. Allport[4] and Trager[5] provide typical examples of what appears to be a consistent point of view concerning this aspect in the development of racial attitudes.

---

[3] Daniel U. LeVine, "The Segregated Society: What Must Be Done," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. L, No. 5 (January, 1969), p. 269.

[4] Gordon W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954), p. 297.

[5] Trager, op. cit., pp. 150, 346.

McCandless points out that social attitudes may be considered either pathological or normal. Pathological prejudice is viewed as being intrinsic to personality needs and would require extended therapy to alleviate. McCandless indicates further that viewing prejudice as normal is simply another way of saying that intergroup attitudes may be directly learned and like any other direct cognitive learning may be fairly easily changed as a person acquires insight or learns new information.[6] Using the rationale that assumes intergroup attitudes to be learned, it would appear that providing the most appropriate learning situation(s) is paramount to developing or modifying specific attitudes in children while time itself is of lesser significance.

Recognizing that intergroup attitudes might possibly be mitagated in learning situations and furthermore that group counseling is a social situation in which students are provided learning opportunities relative to himself and others suggests a need for investigation. A very recent review of the literature by Weinberg[7] that links counseling with race attests to the dearth of research in this area. Only six studies are noted which are related to this topic and none address themselves to using group counseling to improve racial relations.

---

[6] Boyd R. McCandless, Children Behavior and Development, (second edition; New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1967), p. 519.

[7] Carl Weinberg, Social Foundations of Educational Guidance (New York: The Free Press, 1969), pp. 202-206.

Weinberg[8] concludes his discussion with the comment, "we need more than anything else a systematic methodology for investigating interracial interaction in counseling".

Although research data on group counseling as a tool to promote better intergroup attitudes within the school setting is virtually nonexistent, a number of investigations have reported findings on the effect that contact alone has on interracial attitudes.[9] These findings are contradictory and cast serious doubts as to whether mere contact or length of contact are important variables in research that utilizes contact between the races as a means of facilitating social acceptance.

The teleoanalytic approach to group counseling, based on the writings of Alfred Adler,[10] points out that social values promulgated in group counseling are in accordance with man's search for equality and cooperation. The Adlerian concepts of social interest and inferiority feelings provide a theoretical framework from which the hypotheses in this study were generated. Dreikurs and Sonstegard[11] emphasize the parallel between man's advance toward equality and the growing interest in group counseling. Ohlsen,[12] who is not an Adlerian, supports the Adlerian theory to the extent that he describes group counseling in schools as a social situation in which each student is given the opportunity to discuss and appraise his perception of himself, his situation, and the various ways he may attack his problems and obtain reactions from a group of peers.

---

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 206.

[9] Staten W. Webster, "The Influence of Interracial Contact on Social Acceptance in a Newly Integrated School," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 52, No. 6 (1961), p. 292.

[10] Alfred Adler, *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler*, Heinz L. and Rowena Amsbacher, (eds.), (New York: Basic Books, 1956).

[11] Rudolf Dreikurs and Manford Sonstegard, *The Teleoanalytic Approach to Group Counseling* (Chicago: The Alfred Adler Institute, 1967).

Assuming that racial attitudes are learned and can be modified, and furthermore that group counseling is a learning situation conducive to mutual respect and understanding, suggests that the question of improving racial relations through the power of small groups should be investigated. The teleoanalytic approach to group counseling suggests that investigations should focus on variables that might affect equal status of participants in group counseling or those variables which might cause situational inferiority feelings within some participants. This study was undertaken as a step in what the researcher feels should be a systematic series of investigations which would explore the most expedient means of alleviating racial attitudes through the use of group counseling.

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study was (1) to determine the effect, if any, that the race of the group leader(s) has on the improvement in intergroup attitude of racially mixed groups of elementary school children who participate in short-term group counseling or group contact activities; (2) to determine if racially mixed groups of elementary school children, who participate in short-term group counseling, make more favorable improvement in intergroup attitude than do groups of similar composition who engage in contact activities only.

---

[12] Merle M. Ohlsen, Evaluation of Group Techniques in the Secondary Schools, (Lectures at Guidance Workshop, School of Education, Cornell University, 1963), p. 6.

Hypotheses. The following research hypotheses were tested:

1. When racially mixed groups of fifth and sixth graders engage in short-term group counseling, a group that is counseled by a black and white counselor simultaneously will make significant improvement in intergroup attitude when compared to similar groups counseled by either a black or a white counselor and when compared to placebo groups of similar composition that engage in contact activities only.
2. Racially mixed groups of fifth and sixth graders who engage in short term group counseling will make significant improvement in intergroup attitude when compared with placebo groups of similar composition that engage in contact activities only.
3. When racially mixed groups of fifth and sixth graders engage in either short-term group counseling or group contact activities, groups that have both a black leader and a white leader working in the group will make significant improvement in intergroup attitude when compared with similar groups which have either a black or a white group leader.

Justification of the problem. Since the 1954 decision by the Supreme Court, the nation's schools have been delegated the task of racial integration. Further testimony of this commitment was present in the proceedings of the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth. Much attention was focused on the problem of human rights and the conference recommended thirty-six ways for expediting the removal of discrimination and segregation from education, employment, religion, housing, suffrage, and community activities. The creation of a National Institute for Social Health and a National Human Relations Commission was suggested during the conference with the intent of establishing a means of advancing social justice for children, establishing better communications between groups, and promoting the idea of true equality.

Despite the court rulings, legislative statutes, or conference mandates, the point remains that physical racial integration is not necessarily indicative of psychological integration. Both an earlier study by Radke-Yarrow, Trager, and Davis[13] and a later study by Webster[14] provide typical evidence for making this assumption. Cleavage along racial lines continues to exist within schools that have been integrated physically.

Basic to the realization of a great society is the mutual acceptance of all citizens regardless of race. Through developing a pattern of experiences whereby the youth learn to live on a basis of equality and respect with peers from other race groups and by continuing to reinforce such behaviors the likelihood for improvement in future intergroup relationships between blacks and whites should certainly be enhanced. If group counseling is a possible means of alleviating social conflicts and thus a possible medium to be used to effect articulation between the races, then the discipline is obligated to investigate interracial interaction and all variables that might possibly have some relationship to intergroup attitude changes during group counseling.

---

[13] Marian Radke-Yarrow, Helen G. Trager, and Hadassah Davis, "Social Perceptions and Attitudes of Children," Genetic Psychology Monographs, Vol. XL (1949), pp. 327-334.

[14] Webster, op. cit., pp. 292-296.

With the enormity of the racial situation on the national scene, any program or investigation that could supply even a minute piece of pertinent information or for that matter any such endeavor that might instigate or encourage further research would certainly be justified. An extraordinary challenge faces the schools. They must seek out means by which they can become instruments of change in intergroup attitudes. This study which investigates one aspect of group counseling and its effect on racial cleavage finds its justification within this more general commitment that the schools must undertake.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Intergroup attitude. In this study this term refers to a preference of one race (black or white) over another. Within this definition, a preference for either one's own race or a preference for the other race would constitute an intergroup attitude. An intergroup attitude would be operationally defined as the discrepancy between the ratings of the concepts black and white on the semantic differential, a discrepancy between the social acceptance of black children and white children on the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale, or as self-concept as measured by the Self-esteem Inventory.

Teleoanalytic. The teleoanalytic approach to group counseling is characterized by the premise that man is a social being whose actions have social purpose. This approach assumes that man determines his own movements, sets his own goals, and strives to find his place among his fellow man. Social interest and a feeling of belonging permit and stimulate social interaction, while feelings of inferiority restrict social interaction. Revealing and interpreting purposes and goals are salient characteristics of the teleoanalytic approach to counseling.

Group counseling. This term is used to describe group interaction under the guidance of a counselor(s). For the purpose of this study the counselors used the teleoanalytic approach to group interaction.

Contact. The mere bringing together of persons of different races is defined as contact. Contact would not include group interaction intended to provide insights, understanding, and the acceptance of new ideas.

Contact activities. Contact activities in this investigation consisted of light conversation, games, playing records, and looking at magazines.

Counselor. A group counselor is defined as a person whose academic course work includes sensitivity training and training in group dynamics. In this study the counselors were doctoral students in counseling and guidance who had completed all program requirements except the dissertation.

Short-term group counseling. Counseling that does not extend over two or three months is arbitrarily designated as short-term counseling. In this study the counseling sessions were held over a period of two months.

Racially mixed groups. Groups that contain approximately an equal number of blacks and whites are termed racially mixed groups. Racially mixed groups in this study contained five black children and five white children.

Similar groups. Groups that have the same racial composition in their membership but have group leaders of different races are called similar groups within this study. Such groups in this study would consist of those which contained five white children, five black children but the group leadership could be either black, white, or both.

Groups of similar composition. This term is used to describe groups that have the same racial composition in their membership and also have leaders of the same race. Groups of similar composition in this study would consist of those which contained five white children, five black children, and had leaders of the same race.

Placebo groups. The control groups for the study followed the same procedures as the experimental groups with the exception that they did not engage in group counseling. In this sense they were active control groups and are defined as placebo groups.

Interracial interaction. The interaction that takes place within racially mixed groups that are brought together for counseling or tasks of a similar nature that would require interaction among group members.

Group leader. This term is used to describe the counselors in both the experimental situation in which they engaged in group counseling and in the placebo situation in which they functioned only as leaders.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Most investigations are to some extent a compromise between what should be done and what is possible to do, and this research was no exception. The study was limited to sixty fifth and sixth grade children from a single school in one geographical area of West Virginia. The group leaders were limited to two counselors and both using the same rationale for group counseling. As in all quasi-experimental studies using humans as subjects, the researcher could not control the environment of the subjects. The measuring instruments used in the study were limited to the connotative meaning of black and white, the social acceptance of black and white classmates, and a measure of self-concept.

In addition to the above limitations, the study was adapted to fit the schools' schedules and timetables. Requests by school officials to limit the classes to be involved in the experiment and the type of instruments to be used were respected.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of the following discussion is to present representative literature and research pertinent to the following areas: the racial problem; the development of racial awareness and intergroup attitudes among young children; source of intergroup attitude; interethnic contact activities designed to alleviate undesirable racial attitudes; group counseling, and the teleoanalytic approach to counseling; the semantic differential; the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale; self-concept and the Self-esteem Inventory; and research linking race with counseling.

Conclusions inferred from the literature on social attitudes cannot be regarded as being as firm as conclusions reached from the literature on intelligence or physical growth. Attitudes are less tangible; research tools are more ambiguous and usually less reliable and valid; and theory is more complex and not clearly defined. However, suggestions which have come and are coming from research on personal-social attitudes have been important despite the extreme difficulty in conducting investigations in this area.[1]

The racial problem. The intensity of the racial situation in our society is such that it pervades every aspect of life in the

---

[1] Boyd R. McCandless, Children Behavior and Development, (2nd ed.); (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967), p. 519.

United States today. Statements attesting to the racial problem have been communicated via the news media and professional observations, however, typical comments within this review are limited to those which are relevant to the school setting.

According to Levine most educators recognize that the United States is on the verge of being torn apart at the seams by the racial crisis. Since most educators also acknowledge that education is an underlying force in molding the moral character of the nation, every educator must feel obligated to understand the crisis and its implications for education.[2]

Smith proposes that democracy cannot survive in a society that follows a policy of racial separatism where men cannot engage equally in unfettered human associations. School integration is more fundamental than merely the mingling of races within a school building but further implies the incorporation of individuals of different races as equals into a social group.[3]

The world is growing more and more complex and divisions based upon race and ethnicity serve only to exacerbate this tendency. Racial relations are often the focal point for conflict and the means to social change. Rose in noting the above says that it is incumbent upon all whose major field of interest is intergroup relations to provide their students with the best foundation to meet these challenges. Rose further states that the best way to approach the subject of race and race relations is through critical, systematic and objective assessment.[4]

---

[2] Daniel U. Levine, "The Segregated Society: What Must Be Done," Phi Delta Kappan, L:5 (January, 1969), p. 264.

[3] B. Othanel Smith, Saul B. Cohen, and Arthur Pearl, Teachers for the Real World, (Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969), p. 18.

McCreary writes that prejudice is a crucial factor in world stability and that group prejudices held by youth are a deterrant to both internal and international harmony. These attitudes and feelings however, are learned not inborn and the climates within a nation's schools can combat prejudice and promote non-prejudiced attitudes.[5]

Recommendations from the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth[6] were indicative of the priority that this group assigned to human rights and intergroup relations. Intergroup relations were to be emphasized in every grade level of elementary and secondary schools and educational planning was to be directed toward the integration of all youth into a total school culture.

Solomon proposes that the racial problem is equally harmful to children of both races and is not merely a detriment to the black race only. What segregation and racial attitudes has actually done is to cause spiritual and mental deterioration in both races. He suggests further that since schools are a key institution in society it must be concluded that racism is perpetuated by and reflected in our present educational system.[7]

---

[4] Peter I. Rose, The Subject Is Race (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 169.

[5] Anne Phillips McCreary, "Intergroup Relations in the Elementary School," The Journal of Teacher Education, XIV, (1963), pp. 74-79.

[6] Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth, Recommendations Composite Report of Forum Findings, (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1960), pp. 57-61.

Ausubel concludes that the racial problem is more pronounced in lower social-class groups and that these groups constitute a hard core resistance to improved racial relations among school children. Increased physical contact per se between white and black children does little to reduce social distance between the two groups but more intimate personal interaction under favorable circumstances may significantly do so.

The development of racial awareness and intergroup attitudes among young children. Racial awareness apparently takes place at an early age. Goodman[9] reports that by the age of four nearly all normal children are at least minimally aware of the physical marks of race and many will have developed distinct in-group/out-group orientations that are incipient race attitudes. Studies by Stevenson and Stewart[10] and Stevenson and Stevenson[11] provide further evidence that children of nursery school age were not only aware of the physical differences related to race but responded in a manner which indicated the use of stereotyped roles. Goodman[12] using fifty-seven black and forty-six white children between the ages of three and five and one-half as subjects employed a variety of observational and play-interview techniques found that for both the black and white children, 85 per cent had either high or medium awareness of racial characteristics and the favorable or unfavorable social implications of racial membership. This study revealed two other important points: (1) children in segregated nurseries were as racially aware as those in the integrated nursery and (2) the racial awareness increased with age. McCandless and Hoyt[13] found this awareness to exist among preschool children in Hawaii. Despite the fact that Caucasion and Oriental mixing is commonplace in the broader social setting, the children played more with those of their own race. Landreth and Johnson[14] concluded that this awareness appears at about the same time and in equal proportion among children of lower and upper socioeconomic status. Patterns of response to different skin color are present at age three and become accentuated during the succeeding two years. Clark[15] investigated this awareness in both northern and southern communities and found that 75 per cent of the three-year-old black children were aware of the difference between white and colored. Furthermore, this knowledge develops in stability and clarity from year to year.

---

[7] Benjamin Solomon, "Educators and the Racial Issue in Education," Illinois Schools Journal, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Spring, 1968), pp. 27-30.

[8] David P. Ausubel, Readings in School Learning, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969), p. 446.

[9] Mary Ellen Goodman, Race Awareness in Young Children, (revised edition; New York: Collier Books, 1964), p. 253.

[10] H. W. Stevenson and E. C. Stewart, "A Developmental Study of Racial Awareness in Young Children," Child Development, XXIX (1958), p. 408.

[11] H. W. Stevenson and N. G. Stevenson, "Social Interaction in an Interracial Nursery School," Genetic Psychology Monographs, LXI (1960), pp. 37-75.

---

[12] Mary E. Goodman, Race Awareness in Young Children, (first edition; Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1952).

[13] B. R. McCandless and J. M. Hoyt, "Sex, Ethnicity, and Play Preferences of Preschool Children," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 62 (1961), pp. 683-685.

[14] Catherine Landreth and B. C. Johnson, "Young Children's Responses to a Picture and Inset Test Designed to Reveal Reactions to Persons of Different Skin Color," Child Development, XXIV (1953), p. 78.

[15] K. B. Clark, Prejudice and Your Child, (Boston: Beacon Press 1955), p. 19.

There is evidence that intergroup attitudes tend to increase and to become more consistent as the child grows older. Goodman[16] feels that this development of racial awareness is a continuous process through childhood with three overlapping but distinguishable phases. The child moves through a stage of beginning awareness to one of learning or synthesizing racial concepts or values and finally to the establishment of full fledged race attitudes. Research by Radke, Sutherland, and Rosenberg[17] and Hartley, Rosenbaum, and Schwartz[18] also support this viewpoint. Radke and her associates found that the sociometric choices of a child showed that there was an increase with age in the racial consistency of the friendship choices made by black and white children across the two choice settings. Hartley's study found that eighty-six New York City school children shifted with increasing age from specific personal descriptions of individuals to more ethnic designations. Allport[19] also points out that a bigoted personality may be well underway by the age of six but as yet is not fully fashioned.

---

[16] Mary E. Goodman, "Evidence Concerning the Genesis of Interracial Attitudes," American Anthropologist, Vol. 48 (1946), p. 625.

[17] Marian Radke, Jean Sutherland, and P. Rosenberg, "Racial Attitudes of Children," Sociometry, 13 (1950), pp. 154-171.

[18] E. L. Hartley, M. E. Rosenbaum, and S. Schwartz, "Children's Conceptualizations of Multiple Ethnic Group Membership," Journal of Psychology, 26 (1948), pp. 367-386.

[19] G. W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954), p. 297.

While there can be no firm conclusion as to when intergroup attitudes are firmly established research data indicate that these may be crystallized by the upper elementary school years. A very early study by Moreno[20] found by means of sociometry that racial cleavage between black and white children does not occur to a great extent before the third grade and by the fifth grade has reached its peak. Another early study by Criswell[21] confirmed Moreno's findings. Criswell also found that the fifth grade level was the point of mutual withdrawal between black and white children. From this point on children find their preferences, satisfaction, and prestige within one's own color group. Trager and Yarrow[22] summarize their findings by stating that among older children stereotyping and expressions of hostility are more frequent and attitudes more firmly established than among younger children. A study of special interest was carried out by Vaughn and Thompson[23] in New Zealand. The attitudes of 120 children of 8, 12, and 16 years of age toward an ethnic group was studied. An increase in unfavorable attitudes occurred between the ages of eight and twelve but no difference in this respect was found between the twelve and sixteen year old groups. The increase in unfavorable attitudes between the ages of eight and twelve is consistent with an early finding by Horowitz[24] and a later finding by Radke and Sutherland.[25]

---

[20] J. L. Moreno, Who Shall Survive? (Washington, D. C.: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Co., 1934).

[21] J. H. Criswell, "A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavages in the Classroom," Archives of Psychology, 235 (1939).

[22] Helen G. Trager and Marian Radke-Yarrow, They Learn What They Live (New York: Harper, 1952), pp. 150-346.

[23] G. M. Vaughn and R. H. Thompson, "New Zealand Children's Attitudes Toward Maories," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 62 (1961), pp. 701-704.

Source of intergroup attitude. The position taken in this investigation is that a vast majority of the racial attitudes are normal, which means they are directly learned and are not the result of fixations or frustrations which result in deeply ingrained personality needs according to psychoanalytic theory. Personalities of this latter type would be termed pathological and fit the description of an authoritarian personality as described by Adorno.[25] Frenkel-Brunswick and Havel[27] in pursuing this same argument state that parents transmit to their children, not only specific social attitudes but also whatever predispositions to these attitudes which lie within the individual's personality. In the case of a prejudiced personality the prejudice would be of a more general nature as Adorno[28] points out in describing a prejudiced individual as one who seldom limits his target to one race.

---

[24] E. L. Horowitz, "The Development of Attitude Toward the Negro," Archives of Psychology, 194 (1936).

[25] Marian Radke and Jean Sutherland, "Children's Concepts and Attitudes About Minority and Majority American Groups," Journal of Educational Psychology, 40 (1949), pp. 449-468.

[26] T. W. Adorno, et al., The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper, 1950).

[27] Else Frenkel-Brunswik and Joan Havel, "Prejudice in the Interviews of Children: Attitudes Toward Minority Groups," Journal of Genetic Psychology, LXXXII, (1953), pp. 92-132.

Much of the research in the area of intergroup attitudes takes an antithetic point of view as to the source of prejudices. McCandless[29] reviews the literature and concludes that social attitudes may be either normal or pathological. Mussen[30] states that it would be a serious error to assume that there is a one to one correspondence between personality and prejudice. If well adjusted children live among bigoted people they may learn to behave in accordance with the accepted attitudes of their own social group. In such cases, prejudice might be viewed as a reflection of the child's identification with his group and those whose prejudice has this kind of basis would become more tolerant if they were transferred to an environment that promoted a democratic and equaliterian philosophy.

That the average individual member of a group exhibits the degree of social attitude toward members of another group as prescribed by the social distance scale of the individuals group was a finding in the Robber's Cave Experiment by Sherif and his associates.[31]

---

[28] Adorno, Loc. cit.

[29] McCandless, Loc. cit.

[30] Paul H. Mussen, John J. Conger, and Jerome Kagan, Child Development and Personality (second edition; New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963), p. 416.

[31] Muzafer Sherif, et al., Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robbers Cave Experiment (Norman, Oklahoma: Institute of Group Relations, University of Oklahoma, 1961), p. 341.

Literature, reporting that social attitudes are normal to the extent that they are directly learned, is abundant. Johoda, Deutsch, and Cook[32] reports that prejudice is mainly sustained by social usages and sanctions in society rather than authoritarian personalities. Clark[33] states that social scientists are convinced that children learn racial attitudes in the course of observing and being influenced by the existence of patterns in the culture. Suchman, et al.[34] proposes that prejudice based on conformity to social customs of a group is the most common type in our society.

Trager and Yarrow[35] point out that parents condition the attitudes of their children. They sometimes create a negative set through inadequate or imprecise explanations, thus when the child enters school he is much like a mirror reflecting attitudes of the group in which he functions.

Interethnic contact. The question as whether or not mere interracial contact will lead to increased social acceptance and improved attitudes has been the subject of a number of investigations which have produced contradictory findings.

---

[32] M. Jahoda, M. Deutsch, and S. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations: With Especial Reference to Prejudice (New York: Dryden and Company, 1951), p. 365.

[33] K. B. Clark, Prejudice and Your Child, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955), p. 17.

[34] E. A. Suchman, et al., Desegregation: Some Propositions and Research Suggestions (New York: Anti-Defamation League, 1958), p. 58.

[35] Helen G. Trager and Marian Radke-Yarrow, They Learn What They Live (New York: Harper, 1952), pp. 347-349.

Campbell and Yarrow[36] studied one thousand children, eight to thirteen years old, both white and black boys and girls from low income families during a two week stay at summer camp under both integrated and segregated conditions and found that in general the social distance was reduced under integrated conditions, and race as a criterion of friendship exerted less influence at the end of the two-week period. Williams[37] found evidence that interethnic contact in work situations does lead in many cases to the development of friendships across ethnic lines. Earlier studies by Deutsch and Collins,[38] Neprash,[39] and Brophy[40] have also indicated the successful influence of interracial contact in reducing prejudice.

Singer[41] reports that white fifth graders attending integrated schools showed greater social acceptance of blacks than those who attended an all-white school. A major factor in the study was the integrated culture of the adult figures within the school setting. This concurs with findings from the camping study by Campbell and Yarrow.

---

[36] J. D. Campbell and M. Radke-Yarrow, "Personal and Situational Variables in Adaptation to Change," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1958), pp. 29-46.

[37] R. M. Williams Jr., Strangers Next Door (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1964).

[38] Martin Deutsch and Mary E. Collins, "The Effects of Public Housing Upon Interracial Attitudes," In G. Swanson, L. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology (revised edition; New York: Holt, 1952), pp. 582-593.

[39] J. Neprash, "Racial Group Contacts and Social Distance," Phylon, 16 (1952), pp. 207-212.

[40] I. N. Brophy, "The Luxury of Anti-Negro Prejudice," Public Opinion Quarterly, 9 (1945), pp. 456-466.

[41] Dorothy Singer, The Impact of Interracial Classroom Exposure on the Social Attitudes of Fifth Grade Children (Unpublished study, New York University, 1964).

Negative findings on the effect of interracial contact have also been reported. Mussen[42] studied changes in boys' attitudes after a four-week vacation at an interracial camp where blacks and whites lived and played together. The study suggested that intergroup attitudes may be reduced by educational measures, such as encouraging contacts between blacks and whites but the findings on the effects of contact alone were quite inconclusive. Webster[43] studied attitude changes for both white and black students in a California junior high school and found that white students accepted blacks less following integration but black changes in attitudes toward whites were of a more favorable nature.

An investigation by Becker[44] suggested that school camping may have positive effects on improved social relationships, however, the specific determinants for this improvement remained obscure within the experimental design.

Other negative findings are reported by Radke-Yarrow, Trager, and Davis[45] in an early report on the Philadelphia study which stated that stereotype and prejudice do not arise primarily from interpersonal contacts and that contact alone will not change stereotype. Children tend to regard good contacts as exceptions. Vaughn and Thompson[46] reported that interethnic contacts among youth in New Zealand were not effective in promoting favorable attitudes among eight and twelve year old students. Stember[47] concluded that contact was not nearly so effective in reducing prejudiced beliefs as was education.

---

[42] Paul H. Mussen, "Some Personality and Social Factors Related to Changes in Children's Attitudes Toward Negroes," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 45 (1950), pp. 423-441.

[43] Staten W. Webster, "The Influence of Interracial Contact on Social Acceptance in a Newly Integrated School," Journal of Educational Psychology, 52 (1961), pp. 769-783.

[44] Jerome Becker, "The Influence of School Camping on the Self-concepts and Social Relationships of Sixth Grade School Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 51, No. 6 (1960), pp. 352-256.

The research in this section indicates that intergroup contact does not always lead to a reduction of unfavorable attitudes suggesting that other key factors are present and need to be isolated.

Group counseling rationale and the teleoanalytic approach. Counseling and particularly group counseling have been and will continue to be controversial terms with different meanings for different people. Although the teleoanalytic approach to group counseling was employed in this study, the general concept of group counseling is aptly described by Ohlsen who is not an Adlerian.

> In many ways group counseling is similar to individual counseling. In both, the counselor tries to help the pupil to identify and clarify the problems which disturb him, to improve his understanding himself and of his situation, to define,

---

[45] Marian Radke-Yarrow, Helen G. Trager, and Hadassah Davis, "Social Perceptions, and Attitudes of Children," *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, XL (1949), pp. 327-447.

[46] Vaughn and Thompson, *Loc. cit.*

[47] Charles H. Stember, *The Effect of Education on Prejudice Against Minority Groups* (New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1961).

> examine, and test alternative solutions for his problems, and to select an alternative on which he acts. The relationship which the counselor develops with each pupil enables them to discuss problems which heretofore the pupil was unable to discuss adequately. He learns to examine reasons for his difficulty in talking about certain topics, to challenge and consider the limits within which he is expected to work, and to request information whenever he feels the need for it.
>
> On the other hand, there are some real differences between individual and group counseling. Though the counselor must concentrate his attention on trying to capture the speaker's feelings and to help him tell his story, he also must observe how each speaker's comments affect others and help each to participate in the discussion. The counselor's behavior gradually conveys to each and every one in the group his warmth, understanding, and acceptance of them. From the counselor, the members learn to accept one another and to help each talk about his problems.
>
> Group counseling differs from individual counseling in another respect. Each member is given an opportunity to test his tentative solutions in an accepting group of peers and to obtain from them multiple reactions simultaneously, prior to translating his verbalizations into overt behavior. Thus, members learn to help others while they are obtaining assistance from others.[48]

Dinkmeyer points out that the use of group counseling techniques has increased considerable in the past decade. He states further that group counseling should be part of the educational process and should be developed by the pupil personnel services within the school.[49]

The process of group counseling, according to Dinkmeyer, enables members of the group to feel a sense of belonging regardless of any shortcomings. The major effect of group counseling stems from its recognition that most problems are primarily social or interpersonal and the child must learn to interact within the group. Group Counseling provides direct experience in a social situation. The child can express his character through social movement and interaction. Group counseling provides the child opportunities to reveal personal convictions and to develop his self-understanding. Group members through observation and identification come to understand their behavior. They are also provided with the opportunity for reality testing and giving consideration to alternative behaviors.[50]

---

[48] Merle M. Ohlsen, "Counseling Within a Group Setting," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XXIII, (April, 1960), pp. 104-105.

[49] Don C. Dinkmeyer, (ed.), Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary School: Readings in Theory and Practice, (New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968), p. 271.

Dinkmeyer points out that the child learns that he can share experiences with others and still be socially approved. Feedback from the group provides the child with the realization that many of the things he thought unique to himself are often common to others. Group counseling increases the child's receptiveness to new ideas and sometimes even accept ideas that were previously unacceptable to him. The group also provides opportunities for catharsis where self-derogatory and hostile inner feelings can be exposed without punishment.[51]

Depending upon the particular situation the group leader uses a variety of techniques including tentative disclosures and confrontations. The counselor can help the child examine his feelings and also describe feelings in order to help clarify for the child how he experiences the world. Group counseling may use the mirror effect of not only the counselor but also that of the peer group.[52]

---

[50] _Ibid._, p. 272.

[51] _Ibid._, pp. 274-275.

Planned group experiences do not find justification on the basis of economy in the use of the counselors time but rather they provide unique experiences that develop certain kinds of understandings that can only come from other students through their actions and reactions. Leadership in such an experience calls for an understanding of the dynamics of group interaction.[53]

The rationale outlined by Ohlsen and Dinkmeyer provides a broad framework for group counseling within which a counselor might adapt his particular counseling theory or technique, however, according to Ohlsen[54] counselors have only limited flexibility. Each counselor holds certain views concerning people in general as to their ability to solve their own problems or if when left to their own choices, will make those which are socially acceptable. Counselors can and do make some adjustments in their counseling style but few are likely to play successfully the diverse roles required for truly eclectic counseling.

The confusion resulting from switching roles is the basic argument raised by the critics of eclectic counseling who contend that switching roles interferes with the development of a wholesome counseling relationship.[55]

---

[52] Ibid., p. 276.

[53] C. Gilbert Wrenn, The Counselor in a Changing World (Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1962), p. 30.

[54] Merle M. Ohlsen, Guidance Services in the Modern School (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964), p. 78.

A consistent position toward a theory for group counseling has been prevalent in the literature on elementary school counseling in the past decade.[56,57,58,59] This position finds its roots in the writings of Alfred Adler.[60]

Any approach to counseling is enhanced by a theoretical frame of reference. The Adlerian Counseling point of view is often referred to as the teleoanalytic approach. Within this theoretical framework man is perceived as a social being whose every action has a purpose. The teleological concept implies self-determination, a holistic view of man, and man's ability to set his own goals.[61]

Dreikurs and Sonstegard point out that basic to the Adlerian or teleoanalytic rationale for group counseling is the fact that all humans are social beings and each man's personal characteristics express his social movement and interaction with others. The impact of the group on the child is readily observed and the use of the group to influence the child constitutes an effective means to exert corrective influences. This group technique is imperative in a democratic society where the authority of adults has been replaced by the authority of the group.[62]

---

[55] Ibid., pp. 80-81.

[56] Manford Sonstegard, The Basic Principles and Rationale of Group Counseling (Moravia, New York: Chronicle Guidance Publications, Inc., 1967-68).

[57] Rudolf Dreikurs and Manford Sonstegard, "Rationale of Group Counseling," in Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary School, Don C. Dinkmeyer, (ed.), (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968), pp. 278-287.

[58] G. E. Stormer, "Milieu Group Counseling in Elementary School Guidance," Elementary School Guidance Counselor, 1, No. 3 (1967), pp. 240-254.

[59] Dinkmeyer, op. cit., p. 272.

[60] Alfred Adler, The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler, Heinz L. and Rowena R. Amsbacher (eds.), (New York: Basic Books, 1956).

[61] Rudolf Dreikurs, "Adlerian Psychotherapy," In Fromm Reichman and J. S. Moreno (eds), Progress in Psychotherapy (New York: Greene and Stratton, 1956), pp. 111-118.

According to Dreikurs and Sonstegard, the Adlerian concept that maladjustment means mistaken approaches to find one's place among his fellows replaces the explanation of maladjustment as a consequence of pathological processes within the individual. This new psychology provides a formula for democratic living by considering social equality as the basis for cooperation and social harmony.

In group counseling members are taught to deal with each other as equals thus the social values promulgated are in keeping with man's search for equality and cooperation.[63]

The group is more effective than individual counseling for it facilitates the process of insight. Group members learn about themselves through the interaction in the group. The child comes to see himself in others and interactions, disclosure, and interpretations during the sessions are valuable not only for the children toward whom they are directed, but to other members of the group also. Group counseling is in reality a learning process.[64]

---

[62] Rudolf Dreikurs and Manford Sonstegard, The Teleoanalytic Approach to Group Counseling (Chicago: The Alfred Adler Institute, 1967), p. 16.

[63] Ibid., pp. 18-21.

Dreikurs clarifies the relationship between cooperation, social interest and feelings of inferiority. He states that social interest is the feeling of having something in common with other people and being one of them. The capacity for cooperation can be developed when one feels that in spite of external dissimilarities they are not fundamentally different from other people. One's ability to cooperate may therefore be regarded as a measure of his social interest. The greatest impairment to the development of social interest is inferiority feelings for one cannot develop a feeling of belonging if one considers oneself looked down upon or in an inferior position. A person who labors under a sense of inferiority always strives to obtain power that will cancel the supposed superiority of other people. The inferiority feeling is a faulty self-evaluation that may exist only in the imagination of the individual when he compares himself with others.[65]

The semantic differential. Osgood and his associates refer to the semantic differential as a highly generalizable technique of measurement in which there are no standard concepts and no standard scales; rather the concepts and scales used along with the mode of stimulus presentation would depend upon the particular study and the purpose of the research. The concepts judged against a semantic differential may be as varied in nature as may be the modes of signs, and the selection would depend chiefly upon the interests of the investigator.[66]

---

[64] Ibid., pp. 30-34.

[65] Rudolf Dreikurs, Fundamentals of Adlerian Psychology (Chicago: Alfred Adler Institute, 1950), pp. 5, 21-23.

According to Osgood, most authorities are agreed that attitudes are learned and are presumably acquired in much the same manner that other such learned activity is acquired. Attitudes may be considered as tendencies to approach or avoid and in this sense they are evaluative. Attitudes can be ascribed to some basic bipolar continuum with a neutral point, thus implying that they have both intensity and direction. Since factor analysis has consistently identified an evaluative factor with high loadings on bipolar adjectives such as good-bad or fair-unfair, it seems reasonable to identify attitude with the evaluative dimension of semantic space. To get a quantitative index of attitude one would use sets of scales which have high loadings on the evaluative factor.[67]

Nunnally reports the semantic differential to be a very useful type of scale which employs the direct ratings of concepts. The numerous factor-analytic studies of semantic-differential scales lead to the conclusion that there are three major factors of meaning but the most frequently found factor is the evaluative factor. In comparison to the factor of evaluation, the factors of potency and activity are not as strong statistically and are not as clearly measured. The evaluative factor on the semantic differential is almost purely connotative and should provide a good measure of attitudes.[68]

---

[66] Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957), pp. 76-77.

[67] *Ibid.*, pp. 189-191.

Kerlinger states that in studies of values and attitudes with the semantic differential, the investigator would need only use scales of the evaluative factor.[69]

Anastasi states that the semantic differential represents a standardized and quantified procedure for measuring the connotations of any given concept for the individual by computing the score for each concept rated by the individual.[70]

Cronbach reports that the semantic differential was developed for research in attitudes, perception and meaning. A common method of scoring is to compare the ratings of two concepts as a difference or distance score.[71]

The Ohio Social Acceptance Scale. This scale was developed by the Evaluation Division of the Bureau of Educational Research at Ohio State University with the cooperative efforts of a group of elementary teachers in Ohio. The scale consists of six weighted paragraphs designed to represent a continuum from very close friendship to a very definite rejection.[72]

---

[68] Jum C. Nunnally, Psychometric Theory (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), pp. 535-541.

[69] Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research, Educational and Psychological Inquiry (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1965), p. 569.

[70] Anne Anastasi, Psychological Testing (second edition; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964), pp. 626-628.

[71] Lee J. Cronbach, Essentials of Psychological Testing (second edition; New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1960), pp. 501-502.

Bonney and Hampleman point out that one category of sociometric testing involves measures of interpersonal attitude and feelings that are irrespective of a specific functional-type criterion. A typical example of such a technique is the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale which is obviously a very comprehensive measure since every child responds to every other child. Bonney and Hampleman further state that considerable confidence can be placed in the scale results both at the time of measurement and over a considerable period of time since coefficients for test-retest indicate stability over several months.[73]

Raths, in discussing the validity of the test, points out that operationally the requirements of the test are consistent with the implications of the title. The weighting of each paragraph was related to the establishment of a numerical score which would be found to rank students in social acceptance in the same order that competent, informed teachers ranked them. Studies with criterion groups were consistent with the results of the test.[74]

---

[72] Louis E. Raths, "Identifying the Social Acceptance of Children," Educational Research Bulletin, Vol. 22 (March 17, 1943), pp. 72-74.

[73] Merl E. Bonney and Richard S. Hampleman, Personal-Social Evaluation Techniques (Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1962), pp. 61-63.

[74] Louis E. Raths, "Evidence Relating to the Validity of Social Acceptance Tests," Educational Research Bulletin, XXVI (1947), pp. 141-160.

A study by Byrd[75] attests to the validity of sociometric choices, however, Gronlund[76] contends that if a sociometric test is limited to the measure of choice behavior, it is valid by definition.

McLendon reports that the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale has advantages over earlier sociometric techniques in that it deals with acceptance as a quantitative continuum while former methods were based on either acceptance or rejection as they related to working together, playing together, or living together. These techniques were excellent for showing graphic representation of affiliations within a group but are limited in measuring statistically important numbers of acceptances or rejections.[77]

Self-concept and the Self-esteem Inventory. If the assumption is made that personal maladjustments are socially learned, then the theory that self-acceptance leads to acceptance of others takes on practical importance. This theory advanced by Rogers[78] has been supported in the literature.

---

[75] Eugene Byrd, "A Study of Validity and Constancy of Choice in a Sociometric Test," Sociometry, 14 (1951), pp. 175-181.

[76] Norman E. Gronlund, Sociometry in the Classroom (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), pp. 182-183.

[77] Ida Ruth McLendon, "An Investigation of Factors Associated With the Social Acceptance of Children in the Intermediate Grades of Hamilton, Ohio," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1947), pp. 4-5.

[78] C. R. Rogers, "A Coordinated Research in Psychotherapy: A Nonobjective Introduction," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 13 (1949), pp. 169-175.

McCandless[79] says that studies of this specific topic indicate a clear and significant relationship between accepting oneself and accepting others. McCandless[80] reports that findings on this topic are extremely congruent and lists eight such studies.

According to Katz and his associates, one of the functions of social attitudes is to express underlying values and self-concepts.[81]

Combs and Snygg propose that the relationship between self-acceptance and the capacity for accepting others has been demonstrated in studies of counseling improvement and furthermore that we are only beginning to discover the importance of this fact in dealing with human problems. Combs and Snygg suggest that people behave in terms of the self-concepts they possess and therefore poor self-appraisals lie at the roots of social problems.[82]

McCandless concludes that if one assumes that the self-concept is learned and is based on attitudes held concerning one's self, then it has much in common with social attitudes and thus any research that involves changing attitudes should have relevance for changes in the self-concept.[83]

---

[79] Boyd R. McCandless, Children Behavior and Development (second edition; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967), p. 283.

[80] Ibid.

[81] D. Katz, I. Sarnoff, and C. McClintock, "Ego-defense and Attitude Change," Human Relations, 9 (1956), pp. 27-45.

[82] Arthur W. Combs and Donald Snygg, Individual Behavior (revised edition; New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1959). pp. 150-151.

[83] McCandless, op. cit., p. 285.

The Self-esteem Inventory, described in Chapter III, provides a measure of self-concept that is both valid and reliable for use with children. The scale consists of a fifty item inventory which yields a quantitative score of self-esteem from the perspective of the subject. The instrument was designed for use with elementary school children and was standardized using fifth and sixth graders.[84]

Racial factors in counseling. Studies linking racial characteristics to counseling in general are scarce and therefore little is known as to what role prejudice and intergroup attitudes play in counseling relationships. Studies in which group counseling has been used with racially mixed groups to improve racial attitudes appear to be nonexistent.

A study by Milliken and Paterson investigated the relationship between dogmatism and prejudice and the ability to counsel a black client. The evidence, though inconclusive, suggested that prejudice was related to effective counseling.[85]

Phillips matched six black students with white counselors and six with black counselors in a study. Those students who underwent counseling with a black counselor showed more improvement than did those with a white counselor. He concluded that the white counselors had difficulty establishing rapport.[86]

---

[84] Stanley Coopersmith, "A Method for Determining Types of Self-Esteem," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 59 (July, 1959), pp. 87-94.

[85] Robert L. Milliken and John J. Paterson, "Prejudice and Counseling Effectiveness," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 43, No. 7 (March, 1965), pp. 710-712.

Barney and Hall found that white counselors were more reluctant to advise black students with marginal grades to attempt college than their white counterparts.[87]

An interesting study by Banks, Berenson, and Carkhuff; in which four counselors, one black and three white, interacted with eight black clients; found that all the counselers indicated they would return to see the black counselor but would not return to see any of the whites. The black counselor in the study was inexperienced while the experience of the white counselors varied up to a Ph. D.[88]

Although none of these studies are directly related to the topic of this investigation, they do serve to point up the fact that racial attitudes appear to be operating within the counseling situation.

Generalizations from research. The polarization between blacks and whites is already acute and growing considerably worse. This racial cleavage is a result of attitudes learned through misperception.

---

[86] Waldo B. Phillips, "Counseling Negro Pupils: An Educational Dilemma," The Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 29, No. 4 (Fall, 1960), pp. 504-507.

[87] O. Pat Barney and Lurel D. Hall, "A Study in Discrimination," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 43, No. 7 (March, 1965), pp. 707-709.

[88] George Banks, Bernard Berenson, and Robert Carkhuff, "The Effects of Counselor Race and Training Upon Counseling Process with Negro Clients in Initial Interviews," Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 23, No. 1 (January, 1967), pp. 70-72.

These attitudes take on different patterns of development for blacks than for whites but are firmly established by upper elementary school age. There is no common agreement but an abundance of literature supports the position that they are directly learned and as other cognitive learning may be readily changed as one gains new insights. Research on contact activities between ethnic groups is inconclusive as to whether these mixed activities are instrumental in providing new and favorable insights toward the other group. Group counseling and particularly the teleoanalytic approach to group counseling holds strong possibilities for providing a social learning situation in which intergroup attitudes may be favorably improved. The relationship between the Adlerian concepts of inferiority feelings and developing social interest suggests that factors in a learning situation that could generate inferiorities might inhibit social growth. One could assume from this research that time spent in a learning situation is not nearly as important a variable as the manner in which the situation is structured for the learning.

The evaluative dimension of the semantic differential is a measure of attitude and if used with the concept of black and white could provide a difference score between the two concepts. The Ohio Social Acceptance Scale is a measure of how one accepts both his black and white classmates socially. The Self-esteem Inventory is a measure of self-acceptance and thus indirectly a measure of acceptance of others. It may be assumed that within limitations these instruments could be used to operationalize intergroup attitude for purposes of a research study using intergroup attitude as a dependent variable.

There is a dearth of research investigating interracial interaction in counseling, and literature concerning improving racial relations through group counseling is seriously lacking.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Population and Sample

In February of 1969 permission was granted by the Superintendent of the Marion County Schools and the appropriate building principal to conduct two different but parallel studies in which group counseling would be employed and in which changes in students attitudes would be noted. This study was carried out in a Marion County School that included grades one through nine. This particular school provided for an adequate number of both black and white children to permit the intended research. The study was limited to sixty students in the fifth and sixth grade classes. These classes were approximately fifty per cent black and fifty per cent white which was also true of the total school population. With very few exceptions the students families were of the lower socioeconomical levels and lived in the same racially mixed neighborhood.

Design

The quasi-experimental design used was a form of the typical designs employed in the so-called change experiments. The design provided for randomization, pre and posttesting, and with experimental and control groups.

All the children in the fifth and sixth grade were pretested on the instruments described below and then ten children from the above population, five white and five black were randomly assigned to each of six groups. To facilitate communications and for statistical purposes the groups were classified as follows: group one, which participated in group counseling led by a white counselor; group two, which participated in group counseling led by a black counselor; group three, which participated in group counseling led by both a black and white counselor simultaneously; groups four, five, and six were groups of similar composition to groups one, two, and three respectively. These latter three groups, however, did not engage in group counseling but merely engaged in activities that consisted of light conversation, games, playing records, and reading magazines. By engaging in contact activities only, these three groups served as placebo groups.

After pretesting and group assignments had been made; groups one, two, and three met once a week for forty minutes of group counseling. Groups four, five, and six also met once a week for forty minutes to engage in the activities described above. This procedure was followed for eight weeks after which the subjects were administered the same instruments with which they were pretested.

The design provided for control of initial differences that might have existed among students through both randomization and the use of gain scores computed from pre and posttesting. By assigning a placebo treatment to the control groups any contamination due to the Hawthorne effect was controlled. Control of differences in sex, personalities, and effectiveness that might exist among counselors was taken into account by using only two male counselors both of whom were advanced doctoral students and both of whom were familiar with and employed the teleoanalytic technique. Selecting a population, most of whom live in the same immediate area and are from a similar socioeconomic level, provided a control over external events that might have an effect on the outcome variable, however, complete environmental control is never possible in experimental studies using humans as subjects.

Description and Implementation of Instruments

When permission to conduct the study was granted by Marion County Officials, they requested at the time that instruments or measuring devices used in the study would ask no direct or pointed questions that could conceivably introduce racial problems or racial cleavage which possibly did not exist prior to the study. Instruments were selected using this criterion as a primary consideration.

An examination of the literature revealed that the number of instruments available for use with children of elementary school age in the measurement of attitudes and prejudices is small. Instruments designed for other age groups or those designed for use with white children alone are more numerous.

The instruments selected to operationalize and measure the dependent variable of intergroup attitude are described below. The measuring devices used in this study were objective to the extent that the procedures were explicit and reproducible.

The Semantic Differential. This measuring technique was developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum[1] and consists of pairs of bi-polar adjectives upon which the subjects rate a particular concept on a seven-step scale. Attitude toward a concept is defined as the evaluative dimension of semantic space, therefore, to obtain an index of attitude toward a given concept from the differential the bi-polar adjectives must have high factor loadings on the dimension defined as evaluative. Good, bad, nice, awful, fair and unfair are examples of adjectives that are consistently highly evaluative.[2]

Coefficients of stability (test-retest reliability) for the semantic differential when used as a measure of attitude as reported by Tannenbaum ranged from .87 to .93 over a five week period with 135 subjects.[3] DiVesta and Dick[4] report test-retest reliability coefficients of .87 and .79 for 162 fifth and sixth grade children's ratings on the semantic differential.

Validity coefficients for the evaluative dimension of the semantic differential range from .74 to .82.[5]

Since using stimuli other than written words is compatible with the use of the instrument,[6] the two concepts (black and white) were presented as a series of pictures to be rated on the adjective

---

[1] Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

[2] Ibid., p. 191.

[3] Ibid., p. 192.

[4] Francis J. Divesta and Walter Dick, "The Test-retest Reliability of Childrens Rating on the Semantic Differential," Educational and Psychological Measurement, BFIE3, 26 (1966), pp. 605-616.

[5] Osgood, op. cit., p. 194.

[6] Ibid., p. 77.

scales. Adjectives used for the scales were those with high loadings on the evaluative factor.[7,8] Subjects were instructed to respond to sixteen pictures, six representing the concept of black, six representing the concept of white and four used as neutral fillers.

A copy of the semantic differential used in this study can be found in Appendix A.

The Ohio Social Acceptance Scale. This scale of social acceptance was originally developed by Louis Raths[9] to measure the social acceptance of white and black fifth and sixth grade children for each other. The scale consists of six paragraphs, each descriptive of a level of acceptance. The first paragraph describes a person whom one would like to have as a very best friend. The next paragraph describes acceptance in terms of good friends but not necessarily best or closest friends. The third paragraph describes persons who are thought to be good individuals to work with, to play with or to have around but who are not friends or best friends. The next level describes individuals

---

[6] Ibid., p. 77.

[7] Charles E. Osgood and George J. Suci, "Factor Analysis of Meaning," Journal of Experimental Psychology, Vol. 50, No. 5, (1955), p. 331.

[8] Francis J. DiVesta and Richard Walls, A Factor Analysis of the Semantic Attributes of 485 Words and Some Relationships to the Conceptual Behavior of Fifth Grade Children, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, United States Public Health Services, (January, 1969).

[9] Louis E. Raths and E. F. Schweickart, "Social Acceptance Within Inter-Racial School Groups," Educational Research Bulletin, 25, (1946), pp. 85-90.

who are only acquaintances and it would be difficult to say whether they would make good friends or not. The fifth paragraph describes persons whom one does not like and are mildly rejected. The last paragraph is a description of persons who are disliked and who would be rejected if free choice were available in the selection of companions or associates.

The paragraphs are so designed as to measure the social acceptance of children within the class by their classmates.

Each student is given the class roster and the student assigns a number to each name on it. The number corresponds to the paragraph which best describes an individual's opinion of each of his classmates so far as social acceptability is concerned.

The coefficients of stability (test-retest reliability) for this scale range from .78 over several weeks to .73 over several months.[10]

The face validity of the scale is established by definition since the criterion is social choice, however, an extensive treatment of evidence relating to the validity of the scale is given by Raths.[11]

A copy of the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale can be found in Appendix B.

---

[10] Merl E. Bonney and Richard S. Hampleman, Personal-Social Evaluation Techniques (Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc. 1962), pp. 62-63.

[11] Louis E. Raths, "Evidence Relating to the Validity of The Social Acceptance Test," Educational Research Bulletin, XXVI (1947), pp. 141-160.

An instrument of social acceptance enabled the investigator to obtain, for each student in the study, an average score of social acceptance for blacks in his class and an average score of social acceptance for whites in his class.

The Self-esteem Inventory. This instrument was designed by Coopersmith[12] to measure the self-esteem of children. The inventory consists of fifty items to which the subject responds as being like or unlike him. Most of the items are based upon items selected from the Rogers and Dymond Scale[13] and reworded for use with upper elementary school children.

The items were validated by five psychologists, who sorted the items into two groups--those indicative of high and low self-esteem. Items that appeared repetitious, ambiguous, or those about which there was any disagreement were discarded. The items were then tested for comprehensibility with a group of thirty children.[14]

Test-retest reliability for the Self-esteem Inventory is .88 over a five-week period and .70 over a three year period.[15]

The Self-esteem Inventory provided the researcher with a quantitative measure of self-acceptance. This scale was employed with the rationale that a change in self-esteem may be both a cause and/or consequence of acceptance of those formerly rejected.

---

[12] Stanley Coopersmith, "A Method for Determining Types of Self-esteem," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 59 (1959), pp. 87-94.

[13] C. R. Rogers and Rosalind F. Dymond, (eds.), Psychotherapy and Personality Change, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, (1954).

[14] Coopersmith, op. cit., p. 88.

[15] Ibid.

A copy of the Self-esteem Inventory can be found in Appendix C.

The three instruments described above were administered en masse in the four homerooms which constituted the population for the study. Prior to testing the subjects were given ample time to learn the directions for marking the scales.

The differences between the concept of black and white on the Semantic Differential and between acceptance of blacks and acceptance of whites on the Ohio Social Acceptance Scales were assumed to be measures of intergroup attitude. By pretesting and posttesting, gains in the above measures could be tabulated along with gains in self-acceptance as measured by the Self-esteem Inventory. These gains can be found in Appendix D.

Statistical Treatment

The statistic used to treat the data was determined by the nature of the independent variables being manipulated. The two independent variables were: (1) the three variations of race in group leadership and (2) the counseled group versus placebo groups.

A two by three factorial analysis of variance was computed on the mean gain in each group for each of the three instruments in the study. The independent variables which provided the main effects for the analysis of variance were assumed to be nonadditive.

Using the traditional .05 and .01 levels for significance, the following null hypotheses were tested:

1. No significant differences exist in the mean changes in intergroup attitude among the six groups as measured by the Semantic Differential.
2. No significant differences exist in the mean changes in intergroup attitude among the six groups as measured by the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale.
3. No significant differences exist in the mean changes in intergroup attitude among the six groups as measured on the Self-esteem Inventory.
4. No significant difference exists in the mean change in intergroup attitude between the counseled students and the placebos as measured by the Semantic Differential.
5. No significant difference exists in the mean change in intergroup attitude between the counseled students and the placebos as measured by the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale.
6. No significant difference exists in the mean change in intergroup attitude between the counseled students and the placebos as measured by the Self-esteem Inventory.
7. No significant differences exist in the mean changes in intergroup attitude among the groups of students who met with a black leader, a white leader, and both a black and white leader respectively as measured by the Semantic Differential.
8. No significant differences exist in the mean changes in intergroup attitude among the groups of students who met

with a black leader, a white leader, and both a black and white leader respectively as measured by the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale.

9. No significant differences exist in the mean changes in intergroup attitude among the groups of students who met with a black leader, a white leader, and both a black and white leader respectively as measured by the Self-esteem Inventory.

A post hoc treatment of the data was made in which the same statistical treatment was used and the same statistical procedures were used but the statistics were computed separately for blacks, whites, boys, and girls.

The rationale for engaging in a post hoc treatment and analysis of data lay in the fact that the study was to a considerable extent a pioneering effort within this general area for investigation and could well find its justification within the context of instigating or encouraging further research along these lines. This was alluded to earlier in the section on justification of the problem in the introductory chapter.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND FINDINGS

The analysis of data was conducted in two parts. The first analysis consisted of tabulating separately for each instrument the mean gain for each of the six groups on the Semantic Differential, the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale, and the Self-esteem Inventory; and then applying the analysis of variance technique using a two by three factorial design. The traditional .05 and ~~.10~~ .01 levels were used to determine significance. A post hoc analysis was also conducted using the same design as the first analysis with the exception that the analysis of variance was computed separately for boys, girls, black children and white children.

Tabulation of Scores

The pretest scores on the Semantic Differential ranged from 2 to 45 with a mean of 21.350. The posttest scores ranged from 1 to 46 with a mean of 16.083. Since an optimum score for the instrument would be 0, any decrease in an individual's score from pretest to posttest would be recorded as a gain. On the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale the pretest scores ranged from 0 to 9.5 with a mean of 2.638. The posttest scores ranged from 0 to 6.8 with a mean of 2.483. An optimum score on this instrument would also be 0 and any decrease in an individual's score from pretest to posttest would be recorded as a gain. Scores on the Self-esteem Inventory ranged from 30 to 88 on the pretest with a mean of 59.433. Posttest scores on this instrument ranged from 26 to 92 with a mean of 61.500.[1] An increase in Self-esteem from pretest to posttest would be recorded as a gain.

Average scores on the pretest and posttest along with the mean gains on each instrument were tabulated for each of the six groups in the study and can be found in Tables I, III, and V.

Analysis of data. The analysis of variance technique was applied to test the null hypothesis that no differences exist in the mean changes in intergroup attitude among the six groups as measured by each of the three instruments. F values of .002 for the Semantic Differential in Table II, .759 for the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale in Table IV, and .052 for the Self-esteem Inventory in Table VI were obtained and were not significant. An F value of ~~4.02~~ 3.17 was required to be significant at the .05 level.

By failing to reject the null hypothesis the analysis suggests that using a black and white counselor simultaneously as leaders in racially mixed groups of fifth and sixth grade children engaged in group counseling for the purpose of improving intergroup attitudes has no advantages over using either a black counselor or a white counselor. The analysis suggests further that when the combination of black and white leadership is used in conjunction with group counseling the results are not significantly better than the results for placebo groups.

---

[1] Self-esteem is a personal judgment of worthiness. Students in this study were about ten points below the mean for the scale.

Findings from this analysis were in opposition to those hypothesized by the investigator and posed the question as to whether the race of the counselor(s) is a significant factor for improving intergroup attitudes as hypothesized.

Results from the analysis of variance testing the null hypothesis that no significant differences exist in the mean changes in intergroup attitude among the groups of students who met with a black leader, a white leader, and both a black and white leader respectively provided further evidence questioning the significance of the race of group leadership as hypothesized. F values of .711 for the Semantic Differential in Table II, 1.035 for the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale in Table IV, and .075 for the Self-esteem Inventory were calculated and found not to be significant. The required F ratio at the .05 level was 3.17.

Both findings in these analyses are consistent and contribute to the literature by providing evidence supporting the position that a black leader or a white leader can function equally well with racially mixed groups of upper elementary school children who are participating in group counseling designed to improve racial relations; and furthermore either the black leader or the white leader appears to be as effective as a pair of leaders, one black and one white, working as a team.

Despite the fact that the findings were consistent and should prove to be useful, the question remains as to why these findings did not support the investigators hypotheses. While one can only speculate, it appears that the investigator may have based his hypotheses on the proper concepts from theory but focused on the wrong variables to manipulate. Margaret Mead[2] indicates that one of the most striking features of recent years has been the steady spread downwards in age level for sophistication among our youth. This suggests that the age level of the children in this study was well within the range where the interest in a peer society increases and adult influence is on the decline.[3] One could conclude that students who participated in this study did not perceive themselves to be lacking equality or in an inferior position when their race was not represented in the adult leadership but looked to their peers and found themselves equally represented.

Two investigations which parallel one another add another possible dimension in explaining these findings. Daniels[4] and Staples[5] both reported that a team of counselors, one of each sex, was less effective than either a male or female counselor when engaging in group counseling with a group of adolescents. Although both studies justified their results within a psychoanalytic framework, one could still speculate that there may be a variable operating when the co-counselor technique is employed that is detrimental to successful group counseling. If such a variable were operating, then any gains accomplished by employing the co-counselor technique to establish racial equality in the leadership could have been offset by the disadvantages of the technique.

---

[2] Margaret Mead, "Early Adolescence in the United States," _The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals_, Vol. 49, No. 300 (April 1965), p. 5.

[3] Justin Pikunas, _Human Development: A Science of Growth_ (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969), p. 207.

[4] Marvin Daniels, The Influence of the Sex of the Therapist and of the Co-therapist Technique in Group Psychotherapy with Boys, (Dissertation Abstracts, 1958, 18, 1489).

[5] Ethel J. Staples, The Influence of the Sex of the Therapist and of the Co-therapist Technique in Group Psychotherapy with Girls, (Dissertation Abstracts, 1959, 19, 2154).

The data analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis that no significant differences exist in the mean changes in intergroup attitude between the counseled students and the placebos. F ratios of .384 for the Semantic Differential in Table II, .018 on the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale in Table IV, and 2.093 on the Self-esteem Inventory in Table VI were obtained as compared to an F ratio of 4.02 which was required for significance. Although this suggests that we must postpone any decisions concerning the effectiveness of group counseling on improving racial relations pending further investigation; it is noted that the mean gains for the counseled students are higher than those for the placebos on both the Semantic Differential and the Self-esteem Inventory. On the Semantic Differential in Table I the mean gains for the counseled groups were 4.800, 5.100 and 8.600 for an overall mean gain of 6.167. The overall mean gain for the three placebo groups was 4.367. On the Self-esteem Inventory in Table V the overall mean gain for the three counseled groups was 4.600 as compared to .867 for the three placebo groups. Also in eight of the nine cases in Table I, III, and V, the counseled groups had higher mean gain scores than did their placebo counterparts. One is not permitted to conclude on this basis that group counseling is an effective tool for improving intergroup attitudes among racially mixed elementary school children, however, one could propose that the group means appear to be moving in the hypothesized direction. The F ratio of 2.093 for counseled students on the Self-esteem Inventory is indicative of this trend. While 2.093 with 1,54df is not significant at the .05 level, it is significant at the .18 level. Findings on the post hoc analysis lend further support to the conjecture that group counseling can be used to improve racial relations as hypothesized. Both boys and white children when analyzed separately showed gains in self-esteem that were significant at the .05 level. If one takes the point of view that changes in attitudes toward others are preceded by changes in self-concept, then the trend toward an increase in self-esteem that appears to be taking place among counseled students would be consistent with the lack of findings on the other two instruments. One could conclude from these findings that group counseling has the potential for improving racial attitudes within the school setting and the discipline should undertake to discover which variables or interaction among variables affect this potential.

TABLE I

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

		White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselors
Counseled	Pretest	19.000	22.400	23.700
	Posttest	14.200	17.300	15.100
	Gain	4.800	5.100	8.600
Placebo	Pretest	21.800	16.800	24.400
	Posttest	19.000	13.300	17.600
	Gain	2.800	3.500	6.800

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE I

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	48.6000	48.6000	0.384(NS)
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	180.1333	90.0667	0.711(NS)
A X B	2.	0.4000	0.2000	0.002(NS)
Error	54.	6840.5999	126.6778	
TOTAL	59.	7069.7333		

$F_{.05} = 4.02$, $F_{.01} = 7.14$ for 1,54df

$F_{.05} = 3.17$, $F_{.01} = 5.03$ for 2,54df

TABLE III

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE

		White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselors
Counseled	Pretest	2.400	2.950	2.250
	Posttest	2.090	3.070	2.120
	Gain	0.310	-0.120	0.130
Placebo	Pretest	2.700	2.470	3.060
	Posttest	2.800	2.670	2.150
	Gain	-0.100	-0.200	0.910

TABLE IV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE III

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	0.0482	0.0482	0.018(NS)
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	5.5030	2.7515	1.035(NS)
A X B	2.	4.0343	2.0172	0.759(NS)
Error	54.	143.5910	2.6591	
TOTAL	59.	153.1765		

$F_{.05} = 4.02$, $F_{.01} = 7.14$ for 1,54df

$F_{.05} = 3.17$, $F_{.01} = 5.03$ for 2,54df

TABLE V

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY

		White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselors
Counseled	Pretest	52.600	57.600	63.200
	Posttest	56.400	62.600	68.200
	Gain	3.800	5.000	5.000
Placebo	Pretest	58.600	64.800	59.800
	Posttest	59.200	66.600	60.000
	Gain	0.600	1.800	0.200

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE V

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	216.6000	216.6000	2.093(NS)
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	15.6000	7.8000	0.075(NS)
A X B	2.	10.8000	5.4000	0.052(NS)
Error	54.	5587.5999	103.4741	
TOTAL	59.	5830.6000		

$F_{.05} = 4.02$, $F_{.01} = 7.14$ for 1,54df.

$F_{.05} = 3.17$, $F_{.01} = 5.03$ for 2,54df

Post hoc analysis. Since little has been reported in the literature as to which variables and interactions among variables are pertinent to effecting positive changes in intergroup attitudes during group counseling, a post hoc analysis of data was undertaken to further examine data collected. The post hoc treatment of data differed from the data analysis in the study to the extent that it was done separately for boys, girls, black children, and white children. Statistical methods were identical. The results of this analysis are located in Tables VII through XXX.

The post hoc analysis of data resulted in two significant findings. In testing the null hypothesis that no significant differences exist in the mean change in intergroup attitude between the boys who were counseled and their placebo counterparts, a significant F ratio of 4.405 was obtained on the Self-esteem Inventory and located in Table XII. The required ratio for the .05 level of significance was 4.35. The null hypothesis that no significant differences exist in the mean change in intergroup attitude between the white children who were counseled and their placebo counterparts was also rejected on the Self-esteem Inventory and located in Table XXX. The required F ratio for significance at the .05 level was 4.26 as compared to the calculated F ratio of 4.275.

Based on these findings, one would be permitted to speculate that within the limitations of this study the group counseling experience was not meaningful to negro girls, however, this conclusion is difficult to explain. Had the findings suggested the experience had not been meaningful for girls, one might reason that this is a plausable assumption since both group leaders were male.

The investigator felt, however that these findings were indicative of the general trend of the group means in the data analysis for the study and lend support to the conjecture that group counseling may provide a means for improving racial attitudes within the school setting. The reason for not finding significant results for the counseled group as a whole on the self-concept measure could very well have been a result of the size of the sample.

None of the hypotheses tested to provide evidence concerning the race of the group leader(s) was rejected in the post hoc analysis of data. This would suggest that the race of the group leader(s) had little effect in this portion of the analyses also. These findings support those in the data analysis and extend these findings inasmuch as the race of the group leadership does not appear to be an important variable to any special group in the study and within the scope of the investigation.

TABLE VII

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL FOR BOYS

	White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselors
Counseled	4.400	6.500	6.500
Placebo	5.250	5.000	3.250

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE VII

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	2.5350	2.5350	0.103(NS)
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	1.0825	1.5413	0.022(NS)
A X B	2.	4.2325	2.1163	0.086(NS)
Error	20.	2112.7000	24.6482	
TOTAL	25.	2120.5500		

$F_{.05} = 4.35$, $F_{.01} = 8.10$ for 1,20df

$F_{.05} = 3.49$, $F_{.01} = 5.85$ for 2,20df

TABLE IX

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE FOR BOYS

	White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselor
Counseled	-0.160	-1.025	0.100
Placebo	-0.275	-0.720	1.725

TABLE X

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE IX

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	0.5490	0.5490	0.686(NS)
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	3.2614	1.6307	2.037(NS)
A X B	2.	0.8244	0.4122	0.515(NS)
Error	20.	68.6225	0.8006	
TOTAL	25.	73.2573		

$F_{.05} = 4.35$, $F_{.01} = 8.10$ for 1,20df

$F_{.05} = 3.49$, $F_{.01} = 5.85$ for 2,20df

TABLE XI

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY FOR BOYS

	White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselors
Counseled	5.200	13.000	9.000
Placebo	2.500	2.800	-1.500

TABLE XII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE XI

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	91.2600	91.2600	4.405*
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	22.4233	11.2117	0.541(NS)
A X B	2.	19.5300	9.7650	0.471(NS)
Error	20.	1775.6000	20.7153	
TOTAL	25.	1908.8133		

* $p < .05$

$F_{.05} = 4.35$, $F_{.01} = 8.10$ for 1,20df

$F_{.05} = 3.49$, $F_{0.1} = 5.85$ for 2,20df

TABLE XIII

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL FOR GIRLS

	White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselors
Counseled	5.200	4.167	10.000
Placebo	1.167	2.000	9.167

TABLE XIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE XIII

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	8.2446	8.2446	0.286(NS)
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	55.4800	27.7400	0.963(NS)
A X B	2.	2.5837	1.2919	0.045(NS)
Error	28.	4537.2999	28.808	
TOTAL	33.	4603.6082		

$F_{.05} = 4.20$, $F_{.01} = 7.64$ for 1,28df

$F_{.05} = 3.34$, $F_{.01} = 5.45$ for 2,28df

TABLE XV

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE FOR GIRLS

	White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselors
Counseled	0.780	0.483	0.150
Placebo	0.017	0.080	0.367

TABLE XVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE XV

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	0.1504	0.1504	0.388(NS)
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	0.0225	0.0113	0.029(NS)
A X B	2.	0.2457	0.1229	0.317(NS)
Error	28.	61.0610	0.3877	
TOTAL	33.	61.4796		

$F_{.05} = 4.20$, $F_{.01} = 7.64$ for 1,28df

$F_{.05} = 3.34$, $F_{.01} = 5.45$ for 2,28df

TABLE XVII

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY FOR GIRLS

	White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselors
Counseled	2.400	-0.333	2.333
Placebo	-0.667	0.800	1.000

TABLE XVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE XVII

Sources of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	1.7785	1.7785	0,087(NS)
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	2.0637	1.0319	0.051(NS)
A X B	2.	4.4548	2.2274	0.109(NS)
Error	28.	3209.9999	20.3810	
TOTAL	33.	3218.2969		

$F_{.05} = 4.20$, $F_{.01} = 7.64$ for 1,28df

$F_{.05} = 3.34$, $F_{.01} = 5.45$ for 2,28df

TABLE IXX

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL FOR NEGROES

	White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselors
Counseled	0.800	9.400	5.800
Placebo	0.200	6.000	7.200

TABLE XX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE IXX

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	5.6333	5.6333	0.043(NS)
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	297.6000	148.8000	1.142(NS)
A X B	2.	29.0667	14.5333	0.112(NS)
Error	24.	3126.4000	130.2667	
TOTAL	29.	3458.7000		

$F_{.05} = 4.26$, $F_{.01} = 7.82$ for 1,24df

$F_{.05} = 3.40$, $F_{.01} = 5.61$ for 2,24df

TABLE XXI

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE FOR NEGROES

	White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselors
Counseled	0.800	-0.040	0.120
Placebo	0.080	0.220	1.900

TABLE XXII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE XXI

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	1.4520	1.4520	0.423(NS)
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	4.3127	2.1563	0.629(NS)
A X B	2.	7.9340	3.9670	1.157(NS)
Error	24.	82.2960	3.4290	
TOTAL	29.	95.9947		

$F_{.05} = 4.26$, $F_{.01} = 7.82$ for 1,24df

$F_{.05} = 3.40$, $F_{.01} = 5.61$ for 2,24df

TABLE XXIII

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY FOR NEGROES

	White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselors
Counseled	1.600	0.000	3.200
Placebo	2.400	0.400	3.600

TABLE XXIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE XXIII

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	2.1333	2.1333	0.022(NS)
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	51.4667	25.7333	0.270(NS)
A X B	2.	0.2667	0.1333	0.001(NS)
Error	24.	2289.5999	95.4000	
TOTAL	29.	2343.4666		

$F_{.05} = 4.26$, $F_{.01} = 7.81$ for 1,24df

$F_{.05} = 3.40$, $F_{.01} = 5.61$ for 2,24df

TABLE XXV

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL FOR WHITES

	White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselors
Counseled	8.800	0.800	11.400
Placebo	5.400	1.000	6.400

TABLE XXVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE XXV

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	56.0333	56.0333	0.426(NS)
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	352.2667	176.1333	1.338(NS)
A X B	2.	35.4666	17.7333	0.135(NS)
Error	24.	3159.2000	131.6333	
TOTAL	29.	3602.9666		

$F_{.05} = 4.26$, $F_{.01} = 7.82$ for 1,24df

$F_{.05} = 3.40$, $F_{.01} = 5.61$ for 2,24df

TABLE XXVII

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE FOR WHITES

	White Counselor	Black Counselor	White or Black Counselors
Counseled	-0.180	-0.200	0.140
Placebo	-0.280	-0.860	-0.080

TABLE XXVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE XXVII

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	0.8003	0.8003	0.419(NS)
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	1.5707	0.7853	0.412(NS)
A X B	2.	0.4347	0.2173	0.114(NS)
Error	24.	45.7880	1.9078	
TOTAL	29.	48.5937		

$F_{.05} = 4.26$, $F_{.01} = 7.82$ for 1,24df

$F_{.05} = 3.40$, $F_{.01} = 5.61$ for 2,24df

TABLE XXIX

GROUP MEANS FOR GAINS ON THE SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY FOR WHITES

	White Counselor	Black Counselor	White and Black Counselors
Counseled	6.000	10.000	6.800
Placebo	-1.200	3.200	-3.600

TABLE XXX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DATA IN TABLE XXIX

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value
Counseling(A)	1.	496.1333	496.1333	4.275*
Race of Counselor(B)	2.	144.2667	72.1333	0.621(NS)
A X B	2.	19.4667	9.7333	0.084(NS)
Error	24.	2785.6000	116.0667	
TOTAL	29.	3445.4666		

*$<p$ .05

$F_{.05} = 4.26$, $F_{.01} = 7.82$ for 1,24df

$F_{.05} = 3.40$, $F_{.01} = 5.61$ for 2,24df

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was undertaken as an effort toward identifying variables that could enhance the potential of using group processes to alleviate the intergroup attitudes of black and white children.

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study was (1) to determine the effect, if any, that the race of the group leader(s) has on the improvement in intergroup attitude of racially mixed groups of elementary school children who participate in short-term group counseling or group contact activities; (2) to determine if racially mixed groups of elementary school children who participate in short-term group counseling make more favorable improvement in intergroup attitude than do groups of similar composition who engage in contact activities only.

Summary. All fifth and sixth graders in a particular school were pretested on a Semantic Differential, the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale and the Self-esteem Inventory. Ten students, five white and five black, were then randomly assigned to each of six groups which met for forty minutes once a week. One group participated in group counseling led by a white counselor; a second group participated in group counseling led by a black counselor; a third group participated in group counseling led by both a black and a white counselor simultaneously. Three groups of similar composition to the three experimental groups followed the same routine as the experimental groups but did not engage in group counseling, thus serving as placebos.

At the end of eight weeks the sixty subjects were posttested on the same instruments and an analysis of variance treatment was applied to the mean changes in intergroup attitude for each group and as measured by the three instruments.

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. No differences exist in the mean gains in intergroup attitude among the six groups, as measured by each of the three instruments.
2. No differences exist in the mean gains in intergroup attitude between the counseled groups and the placebos as measured by each of the three instruments.
3. No differences exist in the mean gains in intergroup attitude among the groups that met with a white leader, a black leader, or both a white and black leader as measured by each of the three instruments.

The analysis of data failed to reject any of the null hypotheses, thus none of the investigators postulations were supported statistically.

A post hoc analysis of data was made which differed from the data analysis in the study only in that it was carried out on boys, girls, black children, and white children separately. Two findings, were significant at the .05 level. When boys were considered separately, the boys who engaged in group counseling showed significant gains in self-esteem when compared with boys who met for contact only. A significant gain in self-esteem also occured among the white children who engaged in group counseling when compared to the white children who met for contact only.

Conclusions. The following conclusions are based on findings in the study and must be interpreted within the limitations of the study:

1. The analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis that no differences exist in the mean gains in intergroup attitude among the six groups, as measured by each of the three instruments. This suggests that the investigator should reserve judgment as to the advantages of using a black counselor and white counselor simultaneously as leaders in racially mixed groups engaged in group counseling for the purpose of improving intergroup attitudes.
2. The analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis that no differences exist in the mean gains in intergroup attitude among the groups that met with a white leader, a black leader, or both a black and white leader as measured by each of the three instruments. The investigator considered this finding to be consistent with and an extension of the findings in (1) above to the extent that using a black and white team as leaders for a racially mixed group may have no advantage over using either a black or white leader in group activities

that include, but are not limited to, counseling activities and are designed to improve intergroup attitudes.

3. The analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis that no differences exist in the mean gains in intergroup attitude between the counseled groups and the placebos as measured by each of the three instruments. Although this suggests that any decisions as to the effectiveness of group counseling as an agency for improving intergroup attitudes among elementary school children must be reserved pending further investigations, the fact that the counseled students as a group outperformed, but not statistically, the placebos on two of the three instruments and the three counseled groups outperformed their placebo counterparts, but again not statistically, in eight of nine cases allows one to surmise the group counseling could be a factor in ameliorating intergroup attitudes. When boys, girls, white children, and black children were considered separately in a post hoc analysis, boys who engaged in group counseling made significant gains in self-esteem when compared to the boys in the placebo groups. When considered separately, white children who engaged in group counseling made significant gains in self-esteem when compared to white children in the placebo groups.

These findings lend further support to the conjecture that group counseling could be a factor in improving acceptance between the races.

Although there were trends in the study suggesting that group counseling did have a positive effect on self-esteem, the lack of significant findings in the data analysis suggests that there are other possible alternatives to be explored. Different theories, counseling methods, and approaches to the problem need to be investigated. Using diagnostic techniques in the selection of subjects should provide another area to be researched.

Recommendations. Several recommendations for future investigations were suggested by this research and the interpretation of the data.

1. It is suggested that a research study similar to this investigation be undertaken in which a much larger sample of children are counseled in racially mixed groups in order to test the effectiveness of this technique for improving intergroup attitudes.
2. Since this investigation was carried out at a fixed grade level and over a fixed period of time it is recommended that similar investigations be conducted that will vary on these two dimensions.

3. It is recommended that an investigation be undertaken to provide evidence as to what effect the racial composition of the group membership has on improving racial relations through group counseling.
4. Since the child lives in neither a family, school, nor peer setting exclusively but in an encompassing milieu, it is suggested that a future research investigation undertake this aspect of improving intergroup relations through the use of group counseling.
5. It is suggested that future research be conducted that will investigate variables other than those suggested in this study in order that other possible means of facilitating the use of group techniques to alleviate intergroup attitudes will be explored.
6. Since any study in attitudes becomes largely a measurement problem it is recommended that research be carried out in developing instruments to be used in the measurement of intergroup attitudes within an integrated school setting.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Adler, Alfred. The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler. Heinz L. and Rowena Amsbacher (eds.), New York: Basic Books, 1956.

Adorno, T. W., et al. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.

Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Anastasi, Anne. Psychological Testing. 2nd ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.

Ausubel, David P. Readings in School Learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Bonney, Merl E. and Richard S. Hampleman. Personal-Social Evaluation Techniques. Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1962.

Clark, K. B. Prejudice and Your Child. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.

Combs, Arthur W. and Donald Snygg. Individual Behavior. Revised edition. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1959.

Conant, James B. Slums and Suburbs. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

Cronbach, Lee J. Essentials of Psychological Testing. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1960.

Dinkmeyer, Don C. (ed.). Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary School Readings in Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Goodman, Mary Ellen. Race Awareness in Young Children. 1st ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1952.

Goodman, Mary Ellen. Race Awareness in Young Children. Revised ed. New York: Collier Books, 1964.

Gronlund, Norman E. Sociometry in the Classroom. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

Jahoda, Marie, Martin Deutsch, and S. Cook. *Research Methods in Social Relations: With Especial Reference to Prejudice.* New York: Dryden and Company, 1951.

Kerlinger, Fred N. *Foundations of Behavioral Research Educational and Psychological Inquiry.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

McCandless, Boyd R. *Children Behavior and Development.* 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.

Mussen, Paul H., John J. Conger, and Jerome Kagan. *Child Development and Personality.* 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963.

Nunnally, Jum C. *Psychometric Theory.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Ohlsen, Merle M. *Guidance Services in the Modern School.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964.

Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum. *The Measurement of Meaning.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1957.

Pikunas, Justin. *Human Development: A Science of Growth.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Rogers, C. R., and Rosalind F. Dymond (eds.). *Psychotherapy and Personality Change.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Rose, Peter I. *The Subject Is Race.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Trager, Helen G. and Marian Radke-Yarrow. *They Learn What They Live.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

Weinberg, Carl. *Social Foundations of Educational Guidance.* New York: The Free Press, 1969.

Williams, R. M., Jr. *Strangers Next Door*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1964.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

DiVesta, Francis J. and Walter Dick. "The Test-Retest Reliability of Childrens Rating on the Semantic Differential," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, BF1E3, 26, 1966.

DiVesta, Francis J. and Richard Wells. *A Factor Analysis of the Semantic Attributes of 485 Words and Some Relationships to the Conceptual Behavior of Fifth Grade Children.* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, United States Public Health Service, January, 1969.

Dreikurs, Rudolf. *Fundamentals of Adlerian Psychology.* Chicago: Alfred Adler Institute, 1950.

Dreikurs, Rudolf and Manford Sonstegard. *The Teleoanalytic Approach to Group Counseling.* Chicago: The Alfred Adler Institute, 1967.

Moreno, J. D. *Who Shall Survive?* Washington: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Co., 1934.

Sherif, Muzafer, *et al.* *Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robbers Cave Experiment.* Norman, Oklahoma: Institute of Group Relations, University of Oklahoma, 1961.

Smith, B. Othanel, Saul B. Cohen, and Arthur Pearl. *Teachers for the Real World.* Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

Sonstegard, Manford, *The Basic Principles and Rationale of Group Counseling.* Moravia, New York: Chronicle Guidance Publications, Inc., 1967-68.

Stember, Charles H. *Education and Attitude Change: The Effects of Schooling on Prejudice Against Minority Groups.* New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1961.

Suchman, E. A., et al. *Desegregation: Some Propositions and Research Suggestions.* New York: Anti-Defamation League, 1958.

White House Conference on Children and Youth. *Recommendations Composite Report of Forum Findings.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

Wrenn, C. Gilbert. *The Counselor in a Changing World.* Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1962.

C. PERIODICALS

Banks, George, Bernard Berenson, and Robert Carkhuff. "The Effects of Counselor Race and Training Upon Counseling Process with Negro Clients in Initial Interviews," Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 23, No. 1, January, 1967, pp. 70-72.

Barney, O. Pat and Lurel D. Hall. "A Study in Discrimination," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 43, No. 7, March, 1965, pp. 707-709.

Becker, Jerome. "The Influence of School Camping on the Self-concepts and Social Relationships of Sixth Grade School Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 51, No. 6, 1960, pp. 352-356.

Brophy, I. N. "The Luxury of Anti-Negro Prejudice," Public Opinion Quarterly, 9, 1945, pp. 456-466.

Byrd, Eugene. "A Study of Validity and Constancy of Choice in a Sociometric Test," Sociometry, 14, 1951, pp. 175-181.

Campbell, J. D. and M. Radke-Yarrow. "Personal and Situational Variables in Adaptation to Change," Journal of Social Issues, 14, (1), 1958, pp. 29-46.

Coopersmith, Stanley. "A Method for Determining Types of Self-Esteem," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 59, July, 1959, pp. 87-94.

Criswell, J. H. "A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavages in the Class-Room," Archives of Psychology, No. 235, 1939, pp. 1-82.

Frenkel-Brunswik, Else and Joan Havel. "Prejudice in the Interviews of Children: 1, Attitudes Toward Minority Groups," Journal of Genetic Psychology, Vol. LXXXII, 1953, pp. 91-136.

Goodman, Mary Ellen. "Evidence Concerning the Genesis of Interracial Attitudes," American Anthropologist, Vol. 48, 1946, pp. 624-630.

Hartley, E. L., M. E. Rosenbaum, and S. Schwartz. "Children's Use of Ethnic Frames of References: An Exploratory Study of Children's Conceptualizations of Multiple Ethnic Group Membership," Journal of Psychology, 26, 1948, pp. 367-386.

Horowitz, E. L. "The Development of Attitude Toward the Negro," Archives of Psychology, No. 194, 1936, pp. 1-47.

Katz, D., I. Sarnoff, and C. McClintock. "Ego-defense and Attitude Change," Human Relations, 9, 1956, pp. 27-45.

Landreth, Catherine and B. C. Johnson. "Young Children's Responses to a Picture and Inset Test Designed to Reveal Reactions to Persons of Different Skin Color," Child Development, Vol. XXIV, 1953, pp. 63-79.

Levine, Daniel U. "The Segregated Society: What Must Be Done," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. L, No. 5, January, 1969, pp. 264-269.

McCandless, Boyd R. and J. M. Hoyt, "Sex, Ethnicity, and Play Preferences of Preschool Children," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 62, 1961, pp. 683-685.

McCreary, Anne Phillips. "Intergroup Relations in the Elementary School," The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XIV, 1963, pp. 74-79.

Mead, Margaret. "Early Adolescence in the United States," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, Vol. 49, No. 300, April, 1965, pp. 5-10.

Milliken, Robert L. and John J. Paterson. "Prejudice and Counseling Effectiveness," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 43, No. 7, March, 1965, pp. 710-712.

Mussen, Paul H. "Some Personality and Social Factors Related to Changes in Children's Attitudes Toward Negroes," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 45, 1950, pp. 423-441.

Neprash, J. "Racial Group Contacts and Social Distance," Phylon, 16, 1952, pp. 207-212.

Ohlsen, Merle M. "Counseling Within a Group Setting," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XXIII, April, 1960, pp. 104-109.

Osgood, Charles E. and George J. Suci. "Factor Analysis of Meaning," Journal of Experimental Psychology, Vol. 50, No. 5, 1955, pp. 324-338.

Phillips, Waldo B. "Counseling Negro Pupils: An Educational Dilemma," The Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 29, No. 4, Fall, 1960, pp. 504-507.

Radke, Marian and Jean Sutherland, "Children's Concepts and Attitudes About Minority and Majority American Groups," Journal of Educational Psychology, 40, 1949, pp. 449-468.

Radke, Marian, Jean Sutherland, and P. Rosenberg, "Racial Attitudes of Children," Sociometry, 13, 1950, pp. 154-171.

Raths, Louis E. "Evidence Relating to the Validity of the Social Acceptance Test," Educational Research Bulletin, XXVI, 1947, pp. 141-160.

Raths, Louis E. "Identifying the Social Acceptance of Children," Educational Research Bulletin, Vol. 22, March, 17, 1943, pp. 72-74.

Raths, Louis E. and E. F. Schweickart. "Social Acceptance Within Inter-Racial School Groups," Educational Research Bulletin, 25, 1946, pp. 85-90.

Rogers, C. R. "A Coordinated Research in Psychotherapy: A Nonobjective Introduction," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 13, 1949, pp. 169-175.

Solomon, Benjamin. "Educators and the Racial Issue in Education," Illinois Schools Journal, Vol. 48, No. 1, Spring, 1968, pp. 25-34.

Stevenson, H. W. and E. C. Stewart. "A Developmental Study of Racial Awareness in Young Children," Child Development, XXIX, 1958, pp. 399-410.

Stormer, G. E. "Milieu Group Counseling in Elementary School Guidance," Elementary School Guidance Counselor, 1, No. 3, 1967, pp. 240-254.

Vaughn, G. M. and R. H. Thompson, "New Zealand Children's Attitudes Toward Maories," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 62, 1961, pp. 701-704.

Webster, Staten W. "The Influence of Interrracial Contact on Social Acceptance in a Newly Integrated School" Journal of Educational Psychology, 52, 1961, pp. 292-296.

D. ESSAYS AND ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

Deutsch, Martin and Mary E. Collins. "The Effects of Public Housing Upon Interracial Attitudes," Readings in Social Psychology, Revised editon, G. Sevanson, L. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley, editors, New York: Holt, 1952, pp. 582-593.

Dreikurs, Rudolf. "Adlerian Psychotherapy," Progress in Psychotherapy, Fromm Reichman and J. S. Moreno, editors, New York: Grune & Stratton, 1956, pp. 111-118.

Dreikurs, Rudolf and Manford Sonstegard. "Rationale of Group Counseling," Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary School, Don C. Dinkmeyer, editor, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968, pp. 278-287.

Radke-Yarrow, Marian, Helen G. Trager, and Hadassah Davis, "Social Perceptions and Attitudes of Children," Genetic Psychology Monographs, Vol. XL, 1949, pp. 327-447.

Stevenson, H. W. and N. G. Stevenson, "Social Interaction in an Interracial Nursery School," Genetic Psychology Monographs, Vol. LXI, 1960, pp. 37-75.

E. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Daniels, Marvin. "The Influence of the Sex of the Therapist and of the Co-therapist Technique in Group Psychotherapy with Boys," Dissertation Abstract, 1958, 18, 1489.

McLendon, Ida Ruth. "An Investigation of Factors Associated with the Social Acceptance of Children in the Intermediate Grades of Hamilton, Ohio." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1947.

Ohlsen, Merle M. "Evaluation of Group Techniques in the Secondary Schools." Lectures at Guidance Workshop, School of Education, Cornell University, 1963.

Singer, Dorothy. "The Impact of Interracial Classroom Exposure on the Social Attitudes of Fifth Grade Children," Unpublished study, New York University, 1964.

Staples, Ethel J. "The Influence of the Sex of the Therapist and of the Co-therapist Technique in Group Psychotherapy with Girls," Dissertation Abstract, 1959, 19, 2154.

APPENDIX A

Semantic Differential

The purpose of this study is to measure the meanings of certain pictures to various people by having them judge them against a series of adjective scales. In taking this test please make your judgment on the basis of what the pictures mean to you.

There is a set of six scales for each picture. Here is how you are to use these scales.

If you feel that the picture is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

Friendly ___X___:______:______:______:______:______:______ Unfriendly

or

Friendly ______:______:______:______:______:______:___X___ Unfriendly

If you feel that the picture is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not at the very end), you should place your check-mark as follows:

Bad ______:___X___:______:______:______:______:______ Good

or

Bad ______:______:______:______:______:___X___:______ Good

If the picture seems only slightly related to one side or the other, then you should check as follows:

Nice ______:______:___X___:______:______:______:______ Awful

or

Nice ______:______:______:______:___X___:______:______ Awful

The direction toward which you check, or course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seems most like the picture you are judging.

If you feel the picture is not like either end of the scale or is equally like both ends of the scale, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space:

Dirty ______:______:______:___X___:______:______:______ Clean

or

Dirty ______:______:______:___X___:______:______:______ Clean

Important

(1) Place your check marks in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries:

This Not This
_____:_____:__X__:_____:_____X_____:_____

(2) Be sure you check every scale for every picture—do not omit any.

(3) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

Sometimes you may feel as though you've had the same picture before on the test. This will not be the case, so do not look back at what you have checked before. Do not try to remember how you checked similar pictures earlier in the test. Make each picture a separate judgment. Work quickly and do not puzzle over any one picture or scale. What we want is your first feeling about the pictures. On the other hand, please do not be careless for we want your true feelings.

Friendly _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unfriendly
Bad _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Good
Nice _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Awful
Dirty _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Clean
Beautiful _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Ugly
Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

APPENDIX B

The Ohio Social Acceptance Scale

DIRECTIONS: On a separate sheet you will find the name of every student in your class. We want you to put a number in front of every name. The number you put down should be the number of one of the following paragraphs.

"My very, very best friends."	1.	I would like to have this person as one of my very best friends. I would like to spend a lot of time with this person and would enjoy going places with this person. I would tell some of my troubles and some of my secrets to this person and would do everything I could to help this person out of trouble. I will give a NUMBER ONE to my very, very best friends.
"My other friends."	2.	I would enjoy working and being with this person. I would invite this person to a party, and would enjoy going on picnics with this person and our friends. I would like to talk and make and do things with this person. I would like to work with this person and I would like to be with this person often. I want this person to be one of my friends. I will give a NUMBER TWO to every person who is my friend.
"Not friends, but Okay."	3.	I would be willing to be on a committee with this person or to be in the same club. It would be all right for this person to be on the same team with me or to live in my neighborhood. I would be in a play with this person. I would just as soon work with this person in school. This person is not one of my friends, but I think this person is all right. I will put a NUMBER THREE in front of the name of every person I think is all right.
"Don't know them."	4.	I do not know this person very well. Maybe I would like this person, maybe I wouldn't. I don't know if I would like to be with this person. I will put a NUMBER FOUR in front of the name of every person I don't know very well.
"Don't care for them."	5.	I say "hello" whenever I meet this person around school or on the street, but I do not enjoy being with this person. I might spend some time with this person if I didn't have anything else to do, but I would rather be with somebody

else. I don't care for this person very much. I will give a NUMBER FIVE to people I don't care for very much.

"Dislike them." 6. I speak to this person only when it is necessary. I do not like to work with this person and would rather not talk to this person. I will give a NUMBER SIX to every person I do not like.

APPENDIX C

Self-esteem Inventory

Name____________________ School____________________

Class______________ Date__________

Please mark each statement in the following way:
If the statement describes how you usually feel, put a check ( ) in the column "LIKE ME".
If the statement does not describe how you usually feel, put a check ( ) in the column "UNLIKE ME".
There are no right or wrong answers.

	LIKE ME	UNLIKE ME
Example: I'm a hard worker.		
1. I spend a lot of time day-dreaming.		
2. I'm pretty sure of myself.		
3. I often wish I were someone else.		
4. I'm easy to like.		
5. My parents and I have a lot of fun together.		
6. I never worry about anything.		
7. I find it very hard to talk in front of the class.		
8. I wish I were younger.		
9. There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could.		
10. I can make up my mind without too much trouble.		
11. I'm a lot of fun to be with.		
12. I get upset easily at home.		
13. I always do the right thing.		

	LIKE ME	UNLIKE ME
14. I'm proud of my schoolwork.		
15. Someone always has to tell me what to do.		
16. It takes me a long time to get used to anything new.		
17. I'm often sorry for the things I do.		
18. I'm popular with kids my own age.		
19. My parents usually consider my feelings.		
20. I'm never happy.		
21. I'm doing the best work that I can.		
22. I give in very easily.		
23. I can usually take care of myself.		
24. I'm pretty happy.		
25. I would rather play with children younger than me.		
26. My parents expect too much of me.		
27. I like everyone I know.		
28. I like to be called on in class.		
29. I understand myself.		
30. It's pretty tough to be me.		
31. Things are all mixed up in my life.		
32. Kids usually follow my ideas.		
33. No one pays much attention to me at home.		
34. I never get scolded.		
35. I'm not doing as well in school as I'd like to.		

	LIKE ME	UNLIKE ME
36. I can make up my mind and stick to it.		
37. I really don't like being a boy or girl.		
38. I have a low opinion of myself.		
39. I don't like to be with other people.		
40. There are many times when I'd like to leave home.		
41. I'm never shy.		
42. I often feel upset in school.		
43. I often feel ashamed of myself.		
44. I'm not as nice looking as most people.		
45. If I have something to say, I usually say it.		
46. Kids pick on me very often.		
47. My parents understand me.		
48. I always tell the truth.		
49. My teacher makes me feel I'm not good enough.		
50. I don't care what happens to me.		
51. I'm a failure.		
52. I get upset easily when I'm scolded.		
53. Most people are better liked than I am.		
54. I usually feel as if my parents are pushing me.		
55. I always know what to say to people.		
56. I often get discouraged in school.		
57. Things usually don't bother me.		
58. I can't be depended on.		

APPENDIX D

INDIVIDUAL SCORES WITHIN THE GROUPS ON THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, OHIO SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE AND THE SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY

EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

Student Number	Semantic Differential			Ohio Social Acceptance Scale			Self-esteem Inventory		
	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain
White Counselor									
01	25	24	01	2.8	2.8	0.0	70	66	-04
02	12	17	-05	3.3	0.8	2.5	62	48	-14
03	10	13	-03	0.9	1.8	-0.9	72	82	10
04	15	22	-07	1.0	0.3	0.7	58	70	12
05	45	27	18	4.8	3.1	1.7	32	36	04
06	17	07	10	0.4	1.9	-1.5	68	66	-02
07	10	10	00	4.2	3.2	1.0	32	32	00
08	13	02	11	0.0	0.4	-0.4	38	60	22
09	10	09	01	4.6	4.5	0.1	54	58	04
10	33	11	22	2.0	2.1	-1.0	40	46	06
Black Counselor									
21	39	22	17	2.2	1.0	1.2	48	66	18
22	28	36	-08	6.8	6.7	0.1	74	76	02
23	35	21	14	3.3	6.8	-3.5	54	58	04
24	10	04	06	2.8	4.5	-1.7	60	58	-02
25	36	18	18	5.1	1.4	3.7	56	34	-22
26	19	08	11	2.7	1.2	1.5	46	72	26
27	21	07	14	1.7	1.4	0.3	62	68	06
28	19	10	09	0.9	3.1	-2.2	46	66	20
29	12	21	-09	2.1	2.5	-0.4	74	68	-06
30	05	26	-21	1.9	2.1	-0.2	56	60	04
Black and White Counselor									
41	20	01	19	1.2	1.6	-0.4	74	74	00
42	34	41	-07	2.9	3.5	-0.6	54	56	02
43	30	13	17	6.4	5.8	0.6	64	76	12
44	24	03	21	3.8	2.5	1.3	72	72	00
45	07	28	-21	0.9	1.2	-0.3	72	74	02
46	24	05	19	3.5	2.9	0.6	30	56	26
47	33	36	-03	0.7	0.9	-0.2	78	74	-04
48	26	04	22	1.1	0.0	1.1	50	52	02
49	21	09	12	0.8	0.4	0.4	70	64	-06
50	18	11	07	1.2	2.4	-1.2	68	84	16

INDIVIDUAL SCORES WITHIN THE GROUPS ON THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, OHIO SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE AND THE SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY

PLACEBO GROUPS

Student Number	Semantic Differential			Ohio Social Acceptance Scale			Self-esteem Inventory		
	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain
White Leader									
11	37	29	08	7.1	6.6	0.5	56	48	-08
12	02	12	-10	0.4	1.5	-1.1	76	84	08
13	11	13	-02	2.3	1.8	0.5	80	70	-10
14	41	37	04	2.8	4.9	-2.1	60	70	10
15	12	11	01	2.9	0.3	2.6	50	62	12
16	19	08	11	0.7	1.7	-1.0	88	92	04
17	19	13	06	2.5	2.1	0.4	50	34	-16
18	10	09	01	3.0	6.2	-3.2	50	52	02
19	26	12	14	2.5	2.0	0.5	38	50	12
20	21	46	-05	2.8	0.9	1.9	38	30	-08
Black Leader									
31	13	06	07	5.8	3.9	1.9	48	56	08
32	12	08	04	0.6	0.4	0.2	80	68	-12
33	11	05	06	2.9	2.9	0.0	74	70	-04
34	26	22	04	0.7	0.1	-0.6	70	76	06
35	11	02	09	1.3	1.7	-0.4	84	88	04
36	33	14	19	1.1	2.3	-1.2	42	48	06
37	09	12	-03	1.8	4.1	-2.3	72	72	00
38	20	23	-03	3.9	3.8	0.1	54	52	-02
39	29	31	-02	3.4	4.6	-1.2	74	78	04
40	04	10	-06	3.2	2.9	0.3	50	58	08
Black and White Leader									
51	40	11	29	2.1	0.8	1.3	48	52	04
52	42	40	02	9.5	4.1	5.4	54	58	04
53	34	36	-02	7.6	6.2	1.4	72	86	14
54	18	11	07	0.2	1.7	-1.5	84	84	00
55	26	26	00	6.1	3.2	2.9	56	52	-04
56	31	03	28	0.8	3.3	-2.5	34	26	-08
57	20	07	13	2.5	0.1	2.4	64	46	-18
58	18	13	05	0.0	0.6	-0.6	72	78	06
59	03	08	-05	0.4	0.7	-0.3	64	60	-04
60	12	21	-09	1.4	0.8	0.6	50	58	08

ABSTRACT

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was (1) to determine the effect, if any, that the race of the group leader(s) has on the improvement in intergroup attitude of racially mixed groups of elementary school children who participate in short-term group counseling or group contact activities; (2) to determine if racially mixed groups of elementary school children who participate in short-term group counseling make more favorable improvement in intergroup attitude than do groups of similar composition who engage in contact activities only.

All fifth and sixth graders in a particular school were pretested on a Semantic Differential, the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale and the Self-esteem Inventory. Ten students, five white and five black, were then randomly assigned to each of six groups which met for forty minutes once a week. One group participated in group counseling led by a white counselor; a second group participated in group counseling led by a black counselor; a third group participated in group counseling led by both a black and a white counselor simultaneously. Three groups of similar composition to the three experimental groups followed the same routine as the experimental groups but did not engage in group counseling, thus serving as placebos.

At the end of eight weeks the sixty subjects were posttested on the same instruments and an analysis of variance treatment was

applied to the mean changes in intergroup attitude for each group and as measured by the three instruments.

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. No differences exist in the mean gains in intergroup attitude among the six groups, as measured by each of the three instruments.
2. No differences exist in the mean gains in intergroup attitude between the counseled groups and the placebos as measured by each of the three instruments.
3. No differences exist in the mean gains in intergroup attitude among the groups that met with a white leader, a black leader, or both a white and black leader as measured by each of the three instruments.

The analysis of data failed to reject any of the null hypotheses, thus none of the investigator's postulations were supported statistically.

A post hoc analysis of data was made which differed from the data analysis in the study only in that it was carried out on boys, girls, black children, and white children separately. Two findings were significant at the .05 level. When boys were considered separately, the boys who engaged in group counseling showed significant gains in self-esteem when compared with boys who met for contact only. A significant gain in self-esteem also occured among the white children who engaged in group counseling when compared to the white children who met for contact only.

The evidence suggested that using a team of counselors, one black and one white, when counseling with racially mixed groups of elementary school children may have no advantage over using either a black counselor or a white counselor working alone.

The study produced no significant findings that would show group counseling to be an effective means of alleviating racial attitudes; however, a trend in the performance of the counseled groups and two significant findings in a post hoc analysis suggest that future research should be done in this area.

VITA

Isaiah Owen was born in Follansbee, West Virginia. After completing his elementary and secondary education in the Brooke County Public Schools, he volunteered for military service and served two years in the Army Air Force.

After being honorably discharged, he pursued his education at Fairmont State College and West Virginia University. He received a Bachelor of Arts Degree in 1950 and a Master of Arts Degree in 1955 and is presently a candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Education in Counseling and Guidance at West Virginia University.

For fourteen years he has served in various capacities in the public school system of West Virginia and Ohio. He worked in the personnel department for General Electric Company for two years and is presently an assistant professor at West Virginia State College, a position he has held for the past three years.

APPROVAL PAGE

G. E. Stormer

G. Ed Stormer, Chairman

Duane Brown

Duane Brown

Rogers McAvoy

Rogers McAvoy

L. Lynn Ourth

L. Lynn Ourth

Meng-shu Tseng

Meng-shu Tseng